NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXLIV.

JULY, 1885.

LAND AND TAXATION: A CONVERSATION.

MR. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD. Will you explain to me how you expect to develop, in practice, your theory of the confiscation of land to the use of the state?

MR. HENRY GEORGE. By abolishing all other taxes, and concentrating taxation upon land-values.

F. Then suppose A to be the proprietor of a thousand acres of land on the Hudson, chiefly farming land, but at the same time having on it houses, barns, cattle, horses, carriages, furniture; how is he to be dealt with, under your theory?

G. He would be taxed upon the value of his land, and not upon the value of his improvements and stock.

F. Whether the value of his land has been increased by his cultivation or not?

G. The value of land is not really increased by cultivation. The value that cultivation adds is a value of improvement, which I would exempt. I would tax the land at its present value, excluding improvements; so that such a proprietor would have no more taxes to pay than the proprietor of one thousand acres of land, equal in capabilities, situation, etc., that remained in a state of nature.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. But suppose the proprietor of such land to have let it lie waste for many years, while the farmer that I speak of has devoted his time and money to increasing the value of his thousand acres, would you tax them exactly alike ?

G. Exactly.

F. Let us suppose B, an adjoining proprietor, has land that has never yielded a blade of grass, or any other product but weeds ; and that A, a farmer, took his in the same condition when he purchased, and by his own thrift and expenditure has improved his land, so that now, without buildings, furniture, or stock, it is worth five times as much as B's thousand acres ; B is taxed at the rate of a dime an acre ; would you tax A at the rate of a dime an acre ?

G. I would certainly tax him no more than B, for by the additional value that A has created he has added that much to the common stock of wealth, and he ought to profit by it. The effect of our present system, which taxes a man for values created by his labor and capital, is to put a fine upon industry, and repress improvement. The more houses, the more crops, the more buildings in the country, the better for us all, and we are doing ourselves an injury by imposing taxes upon the production of such things.

F. How are you to ascertain the value of land considered as waste land ?

G. By its selling price. The value of land is more easily and certainly ascertained than any other value. Land lies out of doors, everybody can see it, and in every neighborhood a close idea of its value can be had.

F. Take the case of the owner of a thousand acres in the Adirondack wilderness that have been denuded of trees, and an adjoining thousand acres that have a fine growth of timber. How would you value them ?

G. Natural timber is a part of land ; when it has value, it adds to the value of the land.

F. The land denuded of timber would then be taxed less than land that has timber ?

G. On general principles it would, where the value of the land was therefore lessened. But where, as in the Adirondacks, public policy forbids anything that would hasten the cutting of timber, natural timber might be considered an improvement, like planted timber, which should not add to taxable value.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. Then suppose a man to have a thousand acres of wild timber land, and to have cut off the timber, and planted the land, and set up buildings, and generally improved it; would you tax him less than the man that has retained his land with the timber still on?

G. I would tax the value of his land irrespective of the improvements made by him, whether they consisted in clearing, in plowing, or in building. In other words, I would tax that value which is created by the growth of the community, not that created by individual effort. Land has no value on account of improvements made upon it, or on account of its natural capabilities. It is as population increases, and society develops, that land-values appear, and they rise in proportion to the growth of population and social development. For instance, the value of the land upon which this building stands is now enormously greater than it was years ago, not because of what its owner has done, but because of the growth of New York.

F. I am not speaking of New York City in particular; I am speaking of land generally.

G. The same principle is generally true. Where a settler takes up a quarter section on a Western prairie, and improves it, his land has no value so long as other land of the same quality can be had for nothing. The value he creates is merely the value of improvement. But when population comes, then arises a value that attaches to the land itself. That is the value I would tax.

F. Suppose the condition of the surrounding community in the West remained the same; two men go together and purchase two pieces of land of a thousand acres each; one leaves his with a valuable growth of timber, the other cuts off the timber, cultivates the land, and makes a well ordered farm. Would you tax the man that has left the timber upon his land more than you would tax the other man, provided that the surrounding country remained the same?

G. I would tax them both upon the value of the land at the time of taxation. At first, I take it, the clearing of the land would be a valuable improvement. On this, as on the value of his other improvements, I would not have the settler taxed. Thus taxation upon the two would be the same. In course of time, the growth of population might give value to the uncut timber, which, being included in the value of land, would make the taxation upon the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man that had left his land in a state of nature heavier than upon the man that had converted his land into a farm.

F. A man that goes into the Western country and takes up land, paying the Government price, and does nothing to the land; how is he to be taxed?

G. As heavily as the man that has taken a like amount of land and improved it. Our present system is unjust and injurious in taxing the improver and letting the mere proprietor go. Settlers take up land, clear it, build houses, and cultivate crops, and for thus adding to the general wealth are immediately punished by taxation upon their improvements. This taxation is escaped by the man that lets his land lie idle, and, in addition to that, he is generally taxed less upon the value of his land than are those who have made their land valuable. All over the country, land in use is taxed more heavily than unused land. This is wrong. The man that holds land and neglects to improve it, keeps away somebody that would, and he ought to pay as much for the opportunity he wastes as the man that improves a like opportunity.

F. Then you would tax the farmer whose farm is worth $1,000, as heavily as you would tax the adjoining proprietor, who, with the same quantity of land, has added improvements worth $100,000; is that your idea?

G. It is. The improvements made by the capitalist would do no harm to the farmer, and would benefit the whole community, and I would do nothing to discourage them.

F. In whom would you have the title to land vested—in the state, or in individuals as now?

G. I would leave land-titles as at present.

F. Your theory does not touch the title to land, nor the mode of transferring the title, nor the enjoyment of it; but it is a theory confined altogether to the taxing of it?

G. In form. Its effect, however, if carried as far as I would like to carry it, would be to make the community the real owner of land, and the various nominal owners virtually tenants, paying ground rent in the shape of taxes.

F. Before we go to the method by which you would effect that result, let me ask you this question: A, a large landlord in New York, owns a hundred houses, worth each, say, $25,000 (scattered in different parts of the city); at what rate of valuation would you tax him?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

G. On his houses, nothing. I would tax him on the value of the lots.

F. As vacant lots?

G. As if each particular lot were vacant, surrounding improvements remaining the same.

F. If you would have titles as now, then A, who owns a ten-thousand-dollar house and lot in the city, would still continue to be the owner, as he is at present?

G. He would still continue to be the owner, but as taxes were increased upon land-values he would, while still continuing to enjoy the full ownership of the house, derive less and less of the pecuniary benefits of the ownership of the lot, which would go in larger and larger proportions to the state, until, if the taxation of land-values were carried to the point of appropriating them entirely, the state would derive all those benefits, and, though nominally still the owner, he would become in reality a tenant with assured possession, so long as he continued to pay the tax, which might then become in form, as it would be in essence, a ground rent.

F. Now, suppose A to be the owner of a city lot and building, valued at $500,000; who would give a deed to it to B?

G. A would give the deed.

F. Then supposing A to own twenty lots, with twenty buildings on them, the lots being, as vacant lots, worth each $1,000, and the buildings being worth $49,000 each; and B to own twenty lots of the same value, as vacant lots, without any buildings; would you tax A and B alike?

G. I would.

F. Suppose that B, to buy the twenty lots, had borrowed the price, and mortgaged them for it; would you have the tax in that case apportioned?

G. I would hold the land for it. In cases in which it became necessary to consider the relations of mortgagee and mortgagor, I would treat them as joint owners.

F. If A, the owner of a city lot with a house upon it, should sell it to B, do you suppose that the price would be graduated by the value of the improvements alone?

G. When the tax upon the land had reached the point of taking the full annual value, it would.

F. To illustrate: Suppose A has a city lot, which, as a vacant lot, is worth annually $10,000, and there is a building upon it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worth $100,000, and he sells them to B; you think the price would be graduated according to the value of the building, that is to say, $100,000, after the taxation had reached the annual value of $10,000?

G. Precisely.

F. To what purposes do you contemplate that the money raised by your scheme of taxation should be applied?

G. To the ordinary expenses of government, and such purposes as the supplying of water, of light, of power, the running of railways, the maintenance of public parks, libraries, colleges and kindred institutions, and such other beneficial objects as may from time to time suggest themselves; to the care of the sick and needy, the support of widows and orphans, and, I am inclined to think, to the payment of a fixed sum to every citizen when he came to a certain age.

F. Do you contemplate that money raised by taxation should be expended for the support of the citizen?

G. I see no reason why it should not be.

F. Would you have him fed and clothed at the public expense?

G. Not necessarily; but I think a payment might well be made to the citizen when he came to the age at which active powers decline, that would enable him to feed and clothe himself for the remainder of his life.

F. Let us come to practical results: The rate of taxation now in the city of New York, we will suppose, is 2.30 upon the assessed value. The assessed value is understood to be about sixty per cent. of the real value of property. Land assessed at $60,000 is really worth $100,000, and being assessed at 2.30 when valued at $60,000, should be assessed at about 1.40 on the real value; you would increase that amount indefinitely, if I understand you, up to the annual rental value of the land?

G. I would.

F. Which we will suppose to be five per cent.; is that it?

G. Let us suppose so.

F. Then your scheme contemplates the raising of 5 per cent. on the true value of all real estate as vacant land, to be used for the purposes you have mentioned. Have you thought of the increase in the army of office-holders that would be required for the collection and disbursement of this enormous sum of money?

G. I have.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. What do you say to that ?

G. That, as to collection, it would greatly reduce the present army of office-holders. A tax upon land-values can be levied and collected with a much smaller force than is now required for our multiplicity of taxes ; and I am inclined to think, that, directly and indirectly, the plan I propose would permit the dismissal of three-fifths of the officials needed for the present purposes of government. This simplification of government would do very much to purify our politics ; and I rely largely upon the improvement that the change I contemplate would make in social life, by lessening the intensity of the struggle for wealth, to permit the growth of such habits of thought and conduct as would enable us to get for the management of public affairs as much intelligence and as strict integrity as can now be obtained for the management of great private affairs.

F. Supposing it to be true that you would reduce the expense of collection, would you not, for the disbursement of these vast funds, require a much larger number of efficient men than are now required ?

G. Not necessarily. But, whether this be so or not, the full scheme I propose can only be attained gradually. Until, at least, the total amount needed for what are now considered purely governmental purposes were obtained by taxation upon land-values, there would be a large reduction of office-holders, and no increase.

F. How do you propose to divide the taxation between the state and the municipalities ?

G. As taxes are now divided. As to questions that might arise, there will be time enough to determine them when the principle has been accepted.

F. Your theory contemplates the raising of nearly four times as much revenue in the State of New York as is now raised ; how many office-holders would it require to disburse this enormous sum of money among the various objects that you have mentioned?

G. My theory does not require that it should be disbursed among the objects I have mentioned, but simply that it should be used for public benefit.

F. Do you not think that the present rate of taxation is more than sufficient for all purposes of government ?

G. Under the state of society that I believe would ensue, it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be much more than sufficient for present purposes of government. We should need far less for expenses of revenue collection, police, penitentiaries, courts, alms-houses, etc.

F. Then, to bring the matter down to a point, you propose for the present no change whatever in anything, except that the amount now raised by all methods of taxation should be imposed upon real estate considered as vacant?

G. For a beginning, yes.

F. Well, what do you contemplate as the ending of such a scheme?

G. The taking of the full annual value of land for the benefit of the whole people. I hold that land belongs equally to all, that land-values arise from the presence of all, and should be shared among all.

F. And this result you propose to bring about by a tax upon land-values, leaving the title, the privilege of sale, of rent, of testament, the same as at present?

G. Yes.

F. Your theory appears to me impracticable. I think that the raising of such an enormous sum of money, placing it in the coffers of the state, to be disbursed by the state in the manner you contemplate, would tend to the corruption of the government beyond all former precedent. The end you contemplate—of bettering the condition of all the people—is a worthy one. I believe that we—you and I—who are well to do in the world, and others in our condition, do neglect and have neglected our duty to those in a less fortunate condition, and that it is our highest duty to endeavor to relieve, so far as we can, the burdens of those who are now suffering from poverty and want. Therefore, far from deriding or scouting your theory, I examine it with respect and attention, desirous of getting from it whatever I can that may be good, while rejecting what I conceive to be erroneous. Taken altogether, as you have explained it, I do not see that it is a practicable scheme.

G. But your objections to it as impracticable only arise at the point, yet a long distance off, at which the revenues raised from land-values would be greater than those now raised. Is there anything impracticable in substituting, for the present corrupt, demoralizing, and repressive methods of taxation, a single tax upon land-values?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. I think it possible to concentrate all taxation upon land, if that should be thought the best method. Many economists are of opinion that taxes should be raised from land alone, conceiving that rent is really paid by every consumer, but they include in land everything placed upon it out of which rent comes.

G. Then we could go together for a long while, and when the point was reached at which we would differ, we might be able to see that a purer government than any we have yet had might be possible. Certainly here is the gist of the whole problem. If men are too selfish, too corrupt, to co-operate for mutual benefit, there must always be poverty and suffering.

F. My theory of government is, that its chief function is to keep the peace between individuals, and allow each to develop his own nature for his own happiness. I would never raise a dollar from the people except for necessary purposes of government. I believe that the demoralization of our politics comes from the notion that public offices are spoils for partisans. A large class of men has grown up among us whose living is obtained from the state, that is to say, out of the people; we must get rid of these men, and, instead of creating offices, we must lessen their number.

G. I agree with you as to government in its repressive feature; and in no way could we so lessen the number of office-holders and take the temptation of private profit out of public affairs as by raising all public revenues by the tax upon land-values, which, easily assessed and collected, does not offer opportunities for evasion or add to prices. Though in form a tax, this would be in reality a rent; not a taking from the people, but a collecting of their legitimate revenues. The first and most important function of government is to secure the full and equal liberty of individuals; but the growing complexity of civilized life, and the growth of great corporations and combinations before which the individual is powerless, convince me that government must undertake more than to keep the peace between man and man, must carry on, when it cannot regulate, businesses that involve monopoly, and in larger and larger degree assume co-operative functions. If I could see any other means of doing away with the injustice involved in growing monopolies, of which the railroad is a type, than by extension of governmental functions, I should not favor that; for all my earlier thought was in the direction you have indicated—the position occupied by the Democratic party of the last generation. But I see

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none. However, if it were to appear that further extension of the functions of government would involve demoralization, then the surplus revenue might be divided per capita. But it seems to me that there must be in human nature the possibility of a reasonably pure government, when the ends of that government are felt by all to be the promotion of the general good.

F. I do not believe in spoliation, and I conceive that that would be spoliation which would take from one man his property and give it to another. The scheme of the Communists, as I understand it, appears to me to be not only unsound, but destructive of society. I do not mean to intimate that you are one of the Communists; on the contrary, I do not believe you are.

G. As to the sacredness of property, I thoroughly agree with you. As you say in your recent article on Industrial Co-operation in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, "To take from one against his will that which he owns, and give it to another, would be a violation of that instinct of justice which God has implanted in the heart of every human being; a violation, in short, of the supreme law of the Most High;" and my objection to the present system is that it does this. I hold that that which a man produces is rightfully his, and his alone; that it should not be taken from him for any purpose, even for public uses, so long as there is any public property that might be employed for that purpose; and therefore I would exempt from taxation everything in the nature of capital, personal property or improvements, in short, that property which is the result of man's exertion. But I hold that land is not the rightful property of any individual. As you say again, "no one can have private property in privilege," and if the land belongs, as I hold it does belong, to all the people, the holding of any part of it is a privilege for which the individual holder should compensate the general owner according to the pecuniary value of the privilege. To exact this would not be to despoil any one of his rightful property, but to put an end to spoliation that now goes on. Your article in the REVIEW shows that you see the same difficulties I see, and would seek the same end—the amelioration of the condition of labor, and the formation of society upon a basis of justice. Does it not seem to you that something more is required than any such scheme of co-operation as that which you propose, which at best could be only very limited in its application, and which is necessarily artificial in its nature?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. Undoubtedly. The hints that I have given in the article to which you refer, would affect a certain number of persons, not by any means the whole body politic. I conceive that a great deal more is necessary. There should be more sympathy, more mutual help. I think, as I have said, that we are greatly wanting in our duty to all the people around us, and I would do everything in my power to aid them and their children. I do not think that we have arrived at the true conception of our duty, of the duty of every American citizen to all other American citizens.

G. I think you are right in that; but does it not seem as though it were out of the power of mere sympathy, mere charity, to accomplish any real good? Is it not evident that there is at the bottom of all social evils an injustice, and until that injustice is replaced by justice, charity and sympathy will do their best in vain? The fact that there are among us strong, willing men unable to find work by which to get an honest living for their families, is a most portentous one. It speaks to us of an injustice that, if not remedied, must wreck society. It springs, I believe, from the fact that, while we secure to the citizen equal political rights, we do not secure to him that natural right more important still, the equal right to the land on which and from which he must live. To me it seems clear, as our Declaration of Independence asserts, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, and that the first of these rights—that which, in fact, involves all the rest, that without which none of the others can be exercised—is the equal right to land. Here are children coming into life to-day in New York; are they not endowed with the right to more than to struggle along as they best can in a country where they can neither eat, sleep, work, nor lie down without buying the privilege from some of certain human creatures like themselves, who claim to own, as their private property, this part of the physical universe, from the earth's center to the zenith?

F. I was not speaking of charity, but of sympathy leading to help—helping one to help himself—that is the help I mean, and not the charity that humbles him.

G. Then I cordially agree with you, and I look upon such sympathy as the most powerful agency for social improvement. But sympathy is little better than mockery until it is willing to do justice, and justice requires that all men shall be placed upon an equality so far as natural opportunities are concerned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

F. How would you secure that equality? Take the case of a child born to-day in a tenement-house, in one of those rooms that are said to be occupied by several families; and another child born at the same time in one of the most comfortable homes in our city. The parents of the first child are wasteful, intemperate, filthy; the parents of the second are thrifty, temperate, cleanly; how would you secure equality in opportunities of the first child with the second?

G. Equality in all opportunities could not be secured; virtuous parents are always an advantage, vicious parents a disadvantage; but equality of natural opportunities could be secured in the way I have proposed. And in a civilization where the equal rights of all to the bounty of their Creator were recognized, I do not believe there would be any tenement-houses, and very few, if any, parents such as those of which you speak. The vice and crime and degradation that so fester in our great cities are the effects, rather than the causes, of poverty.

F. The principle announced in the Declaration of Independence to which you have referred is one of the cardinal principles of American government—the inalienable right of all men to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That, however, does not mean that all men are equal in opportunities or in positions. A child born to-day is entitled to the labors of his parents, or rather to the products of their labor, just as much as they are entitled to it, until he is able to take care of himself. One of the incentives to labor is to provide for the children of the laborer. The aim of our American civilization ought to be to furnish, so far as can be done rightfully, to every child born into the world, an equal opportunity with every other child, to work out his own good. This, however, is the theoretical proposition. It is impossible in practice to give to every child the same opportunity; what we should aim at is, to approximate to that state of things; this is the work of the philanthropist and Christian. In short, my belief is, that the truest statement of political ethics and political economy is to be found in the doctrines of the Christian religion.

G. In that I thoroughly agree with you. But Christianity that does not assert the natural rights of man, that has no protest when the earth which it declares was created by the Almighty as a dwelling-place for all his children is made the exclusive property of some of them, while others are denied their birthright,—seems to me a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

travesty. A Christian has something to do as a citizen and lawmaker. We must rest our social adjustments upon Christian principles if we would have a really Christian society. But to return to the Declaration of Independence, the equal right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; does it not necessarily involve the equal right to land, without which neither life, liberty, nor the freedom to pursue happiness is possible?

F. You do not propose to give to every child a piece of land; you only propose to secure its right, if I understand you, by taxing land as vacant land in the mode you propose?

G. That is all, but it is enough. In the complex civilization we have now attained it would be impossible to secure equality by giving to each a separate piece of land, or to maintain that equality, even if once secured; but by treating all land as the property of the whole people, we would make the whole people the landlords, and the individual users the tenants of all, thus securing to each his equal right.

F. In how long a time, if you were to have such legislation as you would wish, do you think we should arrive at the condition that you have mentioned?

G. I think immediately a substantial equality would be arrived at, such an equality as would do away with the spectacle of a man unable to find work, and would secure to all a good and easy living with a mere modicum of the hard labor and worriment now undergone by most of us. The great benefit would not be in the appropriation to public use of the unearned revenues now going to individuals, but in the opening of opportunities to labor, and the stimulus that would be given to improvement and production by the throwing open of unused land and the removal of taxation that now weights productive powers. And with the land made the property of the whole people, all social progress would be a progress toward equality. While other values tend to decline as civilization progresses, the value of land steadily advances. Such a great fact bespeaks some creative intent; and what that intent may be, it seems to me we can see when we reflect that if this value—a value created not by the individual, but by the whole community—were appropriated to the common benefit, the progress of society would constantly tend to make less important the difference between the strong and the weak, and thus, instead of those monstrous extremes toward which civilization is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now hastening, would bring about conditions of greater and greater equality.

F. As a conclusion of the whole matter, if I understand this explanation of your scheme, it is this : that the state should tax the soil, and the soil only; that in doing so it should consider the soil as it came from the hands of the Creator, without anything that man has put upon it ; that all other property—in short, everything that man has made—is to be acquired, enjoyed, and transmitted as at present ; that the rate of annual taxation should equal the rate of annual rental ; and that the proceeds of the tax should be applied not only to purposes of government, but to any other purposes that the legislature from time to time may think desirable, even to dividing them among the people at so much a head.

G. That is substantially correct.

F. I am glad to hear your explanation, though I do not agree with you, except as I have expressed myself.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TWO YEARS OF CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

THE experiment of reform, under the Civil Service Act of Jan. 16, 1883, has continued long enough to warrant some estimate of the new system. The provisions of the Act may be grouped under two heads: first, those that prohibit political assessments and other interference with the liberty of the official and the freedom of elections; second, those that make open examinations of character and capacity paramount tests for appointment, or, in other words, substitute a merit system of office for the old spoils system. We need spend no words concerning that intolerable system which the Republicans condemned too feebly and too late to avert a defeat, yet so emphatically as to leave a chance of regaining the reform sentiment, which their folly enabled the Democrats to capture in the last election. It is one of the curious anomalies of politics, that a party whose members of Congress, seeing that the old system was doomed, had the wisdom to surrender their long-cherished patronage; that a party whose last President, comprehending the strength of the reform sentiment, had the statesmanship to enforce the merit system with fidelity; that a party which had in its ranks much the larger number of the influential friends of reform —that such a party should first trust itself, in a doubtful struggle, to a leadership that cast suspicion on that policy and affronted that sentiment, and should then fail to demand the advocacy of that policy before the people until almost the day of election, when the defection of its adherents had become alarming and it was too late to recall them. I have conclusive evidence that the Republican National Committee entered the canvass intending to make the civil-service reform issue prominent in the debates before the people; but over-confidence in leadership seems to have emboldened them to silence about what they did not relish, until the too-late speech of Mr. Blaine in Brooklyn. There never was a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clearer case of defeat through too much faith in management and too little in the higher sentiments and in fidelity to principle. The leaders favored a reform only under compulsion. The strength of the reform sentiment was greatly underestimated. It was not believed that voters would repudiate the candidates rather than the principles of the party. It was not imagined that the Democratic leaders would have the wisdom and patriotism to carry forward a reform policy, as they are now doing, because they feel it to be both a duty and a guarantee of strength. There may be a great conflict in the Democratic party over the reform policy of its administration, but it will end, I believe, in a victory for the people standing for principle over the politicians grasping for spoils.

But the practical results of a reform policy, and not the mistakes of those that have trifled with it, are my subject. The Civil Service Act prohibits officers and employés paid out of the national treasury from becoming the collectors or receivers of assessments, and the solicitation or reception of them in any office, navy-yard, fort, or arsenal of the nation. It is made penal to discharge, promote, or change the compensation of, or to degrade, any public servant by reason of any payment or non-payment for political purposes. The aim was to secure a real liberty to those that have long been the victims of partisan extortion. The Act might well go further, as is the case with the laws of New York and Massachusetts, and forbid the demand of political assessments from any such officer or employee by any person whatever. A large part of the utility of these prohibitions has been the greater courage they have developed in the humbler officials for the defense of their rights. On the other hand, this high legislative condemnation of a familiar form of partisan plunder is causing the people to class it with lottery-ticket selling, gambling and robbery. The public mind more and more comprehends how inexpressibly unjust and disgraceful it has been for the great republic to leave its laborers and poor clerks at the mercy of the predatory extortion of its great officers and politicians. It is more clearly understood than formerly that salaries have been made exorbitant in order that large sums might be extorted therefrom for bribing voters and the public press without arousing a dangerous sympathy for the helpless victims. The amounts contributed since the law went into effect have been far less then formerly. It was not without advantage that Mr. Hubbell, the last great national assessment-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

collector, secured a permanent place on the catalogue of objectionable politicians. He did much to make this whole business of collecting political assessments offensive. Only very callous politicians are ever likely to engage in it hereafter. The next generation will wonder as much that we allowed such a practice, as we do that the last generation tolerated slavery. It cannot be said that the Act has wholly suppressed the prostitution of official authority for personal and party ends. In many ways such authority is still used for such purposes. A large part of this abuse can be arrested only by sounder views of right and duty on the part of the officer, and by the overpowering influence of entire publicity in administrative affairs. But who will deny that a great advance has been made in this direction within the past two years? The demand that public office shall be treated as a public trust, now more general and emphatic than ever, is very significant of the views of the people. The public press, more effectively than before, arraigns the abuse of degrading minor officials into party henchmen, which has been the almost unchallenged abuse of two generations. The Act and Rules, in their whole spirit and scope, not only proclaim the increased strength of such an opinion, but declare it shall be heeded in the future. What greater limitation of the ability of an officer to use his authority effectively for personal and partisan ends can be made than the prohibition of demanding assessments? What exclusion of the opportunities of enforcing servility so great as those provisions of the Civil Service Act and Rules under which more than 14,000 places have been made the prizes of superior merit, and are therefore placed beyond official favor or partisan influence? He that wins his own place is never a henchman.

To measure the extent of these new influences and of the changes they have wrought, we need but compare the terror in the departments and the political savagery shown by the thousands of removals following Jackson's inauguration, with the few removals and the peaceful on-going of the public work under the present administration. The recognized danger to a party of making sweeping, proscriptive removals, and the general feeling, recognized by the Administration, that they are indefensible, are significant illustrations of the reform sentiment. Few politicians are now so blind as not to see that the demand, which they sneered at three or four years ago, that public office shall be treated as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a public trust, is to be a great political force in future elections.

The old spoils system had three great sources of strength: first, the plunder of the salaries of the public servants for filling the party treasury; second, the use of the power of removal for compelling those servants to be party henchmen; and third, the use of the power of appointment for bribing and rewarding for party ends those not in the public service. Such powers obviously add a vast and vicious force to all the venal influences in party politics. Capacity, fidelity, experience, and all high devotion to duty in the public service, were at the mercy of patronage-mongering demagogues leading on a host of hungry office-seekers. Only when, by the aid of the imagination, the significance of these facts is comprehended, can we have a real conception of the mediæval savagery of the maxim that to the victor belongs the spoils. Its piratical spirit was plausibly mitigated by claiming that parties, conceded to be inevitable and useful in their sphere, could never prosper, if they could exist, without the funds and patronage thus secured. A theory that makes extortions and partisan patronage-mongering, rather than sound principles and devotion to the public interest, the source of party strength, is an affront to common sense and universal experience which carries its own refutation.

Why did the Republican Party grow weaker the longer it acted on such a theory, and how did the Democratic Party carry a campaign under a reform candidate without federal officers to tax or to convert into henchmen? Who now pretends that the Republican Party gained strength when, in 1873, under the lead of Mr. Robeson and Mr. Blaine, it refused the appropriations requested by President Grant for continuing the competitive examinations he had established? As such examinations disregard political opinions, and substitute character and capacity for influence and partisan work, as the conditions of appointment, they naturally encounter the hostility of the whole politician and patronage-mongering class. These examinations have been so constantly misrepresented by the partisan press that they are still distrusted and grossly misunderstood. Many candid minds regard them as fanciful contrivances, having little regard for the needs of the service, for giving college-bred men or the literary class a monopoly of office-holding. Many people still believe that a patronage system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of appointments, based on the recommendations of politicians and members of Congress, has been giving us a competent public service. They are surprised when told that thirty years ago that system had become unendurable. The fact is, that in 1855, a system of examinations, known as pass-examinations, was substituted by law for the patronage system. It has ever since been enforced in the departments, except where superseded by the competitive examinations, first under President Grant and finally under the Civil Service Act. These pass-examinations, though largely useful, had serious defects. Those only could take part in them to whom Congressmen, great officers and chieftains gave tickets of entrance, save in cases where mere personal interest or perhaps sympathy prevailed. Hence, aside from the latter, only adherents of the dominant party, and generally of the dominant faction of that party, were admitted. It was a feudal, bureaucratic, exclusive system, which brought in a class either dependent or easily made so. It discouraged the independent manhood and womanhood that it repelled from the service. It contributed to make the minor officials the feudal vassals of their superiors. The pass-examinations were like the competitive examinations in the subjects they covered, but they lacked essential conditions of efficiency. By examining only one person at a time, they allowed no comparison of merit and no opportunity for a selection of the best among the applicants. Pressure behind the single applicant generally forced him in. His monopoly of being examined excluded many more worthy. The peculiar excellencies of competitive examinations are, that they are based on common rights and are open to all on the same conditions. No test of political opinion, no favor of an officer or a politician, no influence of a party, is needed to give access to them. Every person of proper age and apparent qualification can enter them. If he lacks capacity, he will fail. If he has superior merit, he can win a place. Such a system defeats the old feudal monopoly of appointments. It suppresses patronage by enabling the citizen practically to put himself into office. It makes impossible the bartering of places for votes. It arrests the evil of filling the departments with fierce partisan henchmen pledged to fight the battles of their chiefs or party. It wins respect for the Government by presenting it before the people as having supreme regard for character and capacity, and as seeking to do justice to all citizens alike. It aims to do the public business on business

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles. It says to a party in power, "You shall not degrade the public servants into henchmen, nor rob them of their salaries, to keep you in power." It says to the party not in power, "Make your contention on the basis of sounder principles and superior candidates. You shall not stimulate the partisan zeal of your followers, or draw into your ranks the hungry office-seekers, by offering the salaries and offices of this great republic as the spoils of your victory."

But what have been the practical effects of this merit system of examinations? Have they been tried on a scale large enough to make the results decisive? Taking no account of the salutary effects of this truly democratic system as enforced in Great Britain, where for twenty years its influence has been strong in the spirit of our institutions, its trial in the federal offices at New York for over six years might alone answer these questions. During no other six years of this generation has the public work been performed there with such economy and honesty as not to require an investigation by Congress. So strongly, on the other hand, has the competitive system there enforced commended itself to the people of the city and State of New York, that a law was passed in 1883 which required its enforcement in the State and municipal service. Colonel Burt, the leader in applying it in the customs service, is now chief examiner under a New York Civil-Service Commission appointed by Governor Cleveland. Mr. Pearson, the leader in applying it to the postal service there, has the rare distinction of being the first postmaster appointed in our day for his merits as a postmaster, and not as a politician; a fact as honorable to the President and the new administration as it is auspicious for the country.

The examinations under the United States Commission are extensive and varied. The questions for testing the qualifications needed range from those suitable for a mere copyist to those suitable where a knowledge of science, law, history, languages, or the practiced arts are essential. They avoid what is needless, or merely theoretical. For a thorough trial of the new system, two conditions were essential: that it should be broad enough to make the test complete, but not so broad as to make a thorough supervision impossible. If successful, to extend the system would be easy. The examinations in the outset extended to the three great branches of the service, including 5,650 places in the departments at Wash-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ington, more than 5,600 in the postal service, and nearly 2,600 in the customs service ; in all, to more than 14,000 places, known as the classified service, every vacancy in which must be filled from those certified under the Commission on the bases of superior merit as disclosed in the examinations. No mere workmen or laborers were included. As abuses were greatest in the largest offices, the customs and postal offices having fifty or more employés were included. At these post-offices almost half of all the postal clerks and carriers in the Union are employed, and at these customs offices five-sevenths of all the customs officials of the Union serve, and ninety-six per cent. of its customs revenue is collected. At Washington, 77 places, for which appointments are subject to confirmation by the Senate, and 144 places, for various technical reasons, are excepted from the examinations, but not otherwise from the rules. The filling of the classified service under the Act and Rules began July 16, 1883, and has continued without exception under the present as under the last administration. For that purpose more than 11,000 persons have been examined, and more than 225 separate examinations, in all parts of the Union, have been held. Of the 6,347 persons examined in the year ending Jan. 16, 1885, 5,525 were males and 822 were females. Of those examined, about two-thirds have been found competent for appointment. From those graded highest among them, nearly 2,600 have been appointed on certifications made under the Commission, each appointment being made for the probationary period of six months, and a permanent appointment depending on good conduct and efficiency during the probation. Those appointees unquestionably are about equally divided between the great parties. In but a single case has political discrimination in making an appointment been charged. An investigation showed it to be unfounded.

The Act and the Rules have been found easily practicable. That has been done which their enemies have charged to be impossible and visionary. The useful effects of the merit system are decisively shown. At the end of the first year, President Arthur in a message declared the good results foreshadowed to have been more than realized. "The system has fully answered the expectations of its friends in securing competent and faithful public servants, and protecting officials from personal importunity." In his message of January last, expressing as he declared the views of every member of his Cabinet, he "congratulated the country upon the success of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labors of the Commission." Accepting this view, Congress voted an increase of its clerical force. A committee of the last Congress, composed of eight Democrats and five Republicans, made a unanimous report, in which it declared itself "entirely satisfied with the thorough, conscientious, and non-partisan work" of the Commission, and declared that "the continuance of its work will in a large degree tend to eradicate the evils in the civil service of the government." The last report of the Commission sets forth in great detail the results of its work, and this report it sends to those who request it. The new administration appoints those certified by the Commission, irrespective of their political opinions.

Some special effects and conditions of the new system are worthy of notice. The theory of its enemies that it would fill the service with mere boys and girls, finds its answer in the fact that the average age of all those examined has been thirty years, thus showing an average period of nearly fourteen years of practical life between leaving the schools and entering office. The prediction that college-bred men would monopolize appointments, is answered by the facts that of 5,556 applicants as to whom the record is complete, the education was as follows: 3,920 only in common schools; 1,096 in part in high schools or academies; 91 in part in business-colleges; 449 in part in colleges. More than 70 per cent., therefore, had only a public-school education. This friendly relation between the merit system and the public-school system will greatly strengthen both. In no way can a nation do more to advance the dignity and success of the public-schools of the people than by making excellence, in the good character they develop, and the studies they teach, the tests for the honor and profit of holding its offices and enjoying its salaries. The youth of the country will be quick to see that the new system makes character and attainments more effective than partisan activity or flunkyism for securing appointments. It will be impossible for politicians to ridicule successfully the schoolmaster's-test, or to make that of the patronage-monger or the politician appear more reputable. It will never be possible to justify the taxing of all the people for educating all the children, and then to deny that superior excellence in that education is an irrelevant test for office. How effectively the tests of the merit-system are in securing practical men for the public work, is shown

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the facts given in that report, that of the 109 in the departments at Washington who served their six months' probation, 107 had won permanent appointments ; and that, of the more than 500 appointments under the rules there, only three were removed in a whole year! Neither the Civil Service Law nor the Rules in any way limit the authority to remove, except that Rule 2 forbids removals for refusing to pay political assessments or to render political service. Every official in a department may be removed once a year or once a month, if the appointing power thinks it good policy to do so. It would raise less opposition to remove all the 600 appointed under the Rules, at Washington, than it would to remove twenty *protégés* of as many great officers or politicians. But a more enlightened public opinion has unquestionably put some salutary limits to the abuse of the power of removal. Most of the unjustifiable removals are made, not to get Anderson out, but to put Snooks in. The power to put in the Snookses of the lords of politics no longer exists, and therefore the worthy Andersons are not so likely to be removed while they are both faithful and efficient. It is hardly necessary to add, that a system which thus arrests the despotism and monopoly of the politician class, which destroys patronage by enabling the people to work their own way to office, which forbids more than two members of the same family being appointed to the departments at Washington, yet allows removals at discretion, is fatal to every form of bureaucracy. I have no space for doing justice to the difficult work of the Commission in its more trying stages, now happily past, nor for indicating appropriate extensions of the examinations. The new system is permanently established. A merit service in place of a partisan service will be more and more demanded by States and cities. The people will triumph over the politician. Those seeking high office in the future will more heed the new power in politics. We are to have a new political science, the science of administration.

The old spoils-system spirit is, however, still alarmingly audacious. I could fill an article with illustrations. These are samples: Not many weeks since, a young lady in a great department, amid sobs and imprecations, charged the head of the office there, in my hearing, with putting her out of a laborer's place, to make a place for his "own sweetheart." The charge was not denied. That lady has since, by her merits, in an examination,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

won a higher position. This advertisement is from a leading Washington journal, of April 17, 1885 :

"I will give $500 for a position in any branch of the government service that will evade the Civil Service. Address Plato, Star office."

The member of Congress from the 21st Ohio district authorizes me to say that in two instances within a few weeks he has been offered one thousand dollars for his influence for procuring an office. I have a letter dated London, March 7, 1885, written by a merchant of that city named Charles O. Olson, to the Hon. Leopold Morse of Boston, in which an offer is made of $1,500 for procuring the consulship at Gothenburg, Sweden. Does any one imagine these to be isolated or even rare cases ? Does it seem needless, in view of such facts, to have the examinations extended?

DORMAN B. EATON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS CHRISTIANITY DECLINING?

PAINTERS find a difficulty in representing the rising sun in such a way that it shall not be mistaken for the setting sun. Is the sun rising, or is it setting? That is substantially our question in this paper. Is it sunrise, or is it sunset?

No one can be familiar with what is now written in books, newspapers and magazines, or with what is spoken upon the street or in convention, without being aware that infidels are evincing great assurance of unfaith, and that among some even who class themselves as believers there are traces of disquiet verging at times even toward disheartenment. Considerable idea evidently prevails that Christianity is showing tokens of exhaustion, and that any expectations that may be cherished of its future achievement are to be founded far more on what it has done in the past, than on anything that it shows itself competent to do at present.

There is in the ranks of unbelievers such a show of obituary and such a lavish parade of funereal rites, that it is easily explained if some who are of the contrary mind are nevertheless dolorously affected by it, and constrained to suspect that the demise of our cherished faith is at least imminent, even if it be not already transpired. For such as well as for all, it will certainly be time well expended to come as closely as we can to the facts of the case, to discover what are the obstacles that lie in the way of a more rapid advance of Christianity, and to consult the data so numerously afforded, in order to learn whether Christianity is at present at a stand-still, and if not, whether its movements are forward or backward.

The tendency to prognosticate evil of Christ and his doctrine is no new thing in the world. In the sixteenth chapter of Mark we read, "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had bought sweet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spices that they might come and anoint him;" and this is what the world has been volunteering to do for Jesus now these 1800 years. The ointment and the embalmers are at the sepulcher betimes, but the Lord walks yet in the garden. In the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of December, 1879, Froude says, "Protestantism has failed." In the "Atlantic Monthly" of a little earlier date Goldwin Smith writes, "Belief in Christianity as a revealed and supernatural religion has given way." In 1868 Dr. Ewer issued a book entitled "Protestantism a failure." Buckle, in his "History of Civilization in England," claimed that Protestantism had seen its best days. "In the times of Aaron Burr," says Parton, "it was confidently predicted that Christianity could not survive two more generations." Of the same period another writer states that "Wild and vague expectations were everywhere entertained, especially among the young, of a new order of things about to commence, in which Christianity would be laid aside as an obsolete system." Considerably more than a century ago Voltaire said, "Before the beginning of the 19th century Christianity will have disappeared from the earth." It is an instructive coincidence that the room in which Voltaire uttered these words has since been used as a Bible repository. "They came unto the sepulchre bringing the spices which they had prepared, and they entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." And it is still so; a redundancy of ointment, but no corpse.

The question whether Christianity is a waxing or a waning factor in history and society is not one that can be easily determined. No man's bare opinion or impression regarding the matter is of the slightest worth. If you stand on the *Mer de Glace* you will be likely to decide upon the instant that nothing like true movement pertains to it; but if you drive a stake into the ice at Trelaporte, over against another driven into the ground at the glacier's edge, on coming back twenty-four hours later you will find the stakes twenty inches apart. There are but twelve inches of water in the bay, and the first surmise will be that the tide is going out; but those twelve inches are no more likely to be the residue of an ebb-tide than to be the precursor of a flood tide, and which of the two it is you will be able to decide only by continued observation and successive measurements. An hour after sunrise the shadows are as long as they are an hour before sunset; and unless you have other grounds to base your judgment upon, you will have to watch

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the drift of the shadows awhile before you can tell whether it is night or morning. So as relates to the condition of things morally and religiously, no single year or decade is competent to make to us any final statement as to the trend of events. "There is a great deal of vice in the world." Certainly; but how much was there thirty, fifty, one hundred, one thousand years ago? "Very few additions are being made to the Christian Church." That depends something upon what you understand by "few"; but aside from that, do you know how the number of church-members now compares with what it was in 1870, 1850, 1800? "An exceedingly small portion of the earth, even after eighteen centuries, has ever even heard of Jesus Christ, which certainly tells heavily against the claim of Christianity to be the final and universal religion." It has to be conceded that Christianity is a good way from being universal yet; but do you know whether there has been a gain or a loss in this respect during the last century, half century, quarter century? "Infidelity is rampant even on Christian soil." Have you the facts at command as to what infidelity was and did in 1785 or in 1835? It is in the books. It is a matter of history. It is infinitely easier to trust our impressions and extemporize our opinions than to search for the facts that will enable us to knit our conclusions into historic grounds.

Before going on to mention some few tokens of the inherent vigor of Christianity, and to state some successive measurements of its moving tide, I want to adduce a consideration or two that will help to a juster appreciation of those tokens and measurements. It has to be remembered first of all what sort of resistance it is that Christianity is attempting to antagonize. Power is calculable by the results it yields, but if we are attempting to estimate the force of a projectile, we shall take account not only of the velocity at which it moves, but also of the quality and tenacity of the resisting material which it shows itself competent to penetrate. One evidence of the vital energy of Christianity is shown in this, that in all its movements and demands and prohibitions it runs steadily counter to the whole grain of natural desire. Whatever Christianity has done or may yet be doing in the world, it is doing it all in the teeth of spontaneous impulse. It is a system that requires us to love our neighbor as we do ourselves. It enjoins upon us to crucify our affections and lusts. It is a religion that is contented with nothing less than sacrifice. It meets the soul at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the level of its higher needs to be sure; but that is not the level at which we find it our first impulse to live. Christianity prohibits our doing a host of things that we would like to do, and requires us to do another host of things that we have no disposition to do. Every inch that Christianity has gained or may still be gaining it has gained by a square fight. All advance that it has made has been so much conquest on the one side over against so much reluctant and contested surrender on the other. In estimating the draught-power of a locomotive, we must consider not only the rate at which it moves and the tons of freight it drags, but the grade at which it is pulling. If I can row eight miles an hour, it is important to know whether I can do it with the wind, or in the teeth of it. There is nothing evangelical in a man's first impulses. So inestimating the inherent vigor of Christianity it must be studiously considered that in all its advances it has had steadily trained upon it the charged and primed artillery of man's natural lust and congenital ambition. All the way from the last man that became a Christian, back to Peter who forsook his fishing-tackle at the Lord's call, the process of becoming a Christian has been a process of surrender. Count that carefully in calculating the spiritual dynamics of the doctrine of the Nazarene.

In estimating the vital energy of Christianity, especially in our own country and times, account must also be made of the intellectual autonomy of the individual. Every man among us claims the right to reach his own conclusions by his own methods. The historic is everywhere in danger of being disparaged. Every year that is added to an institution is made just so much added ground for questioning its validity. If a man has not sufficient vigor to discover something new, he apes intellectual enterprise by discountenancing what is old. The consequence is that there is very little now of what might be called hereditary faith. A young man nowadays is not confessing Christ because his father confessed him. There is very little of what might be termed doctrinal momentum or evangelical contagion. The temper of the times might be expressed by saying that there is a prevalent intellectual mutiny against the traditional. So that if there is reason to suppose that Christianity is making any headway, it is another proof of the inherent vigor of Christianity that it is able to cope with such disadvantages and counteract such stern resistance.

One other troublesome element in the question felt so keenly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by us Americans, is our vast foreign immigration, and the questionable quality of so large a percentage of the population that reaches us by this means of accession. During thirty years ending with 1880, eight millions of foreigners came to us. These, with their immediate descendants, would mount up to something like twelve millions, or nearly a quarter of our entire population. And this adventitious element is foreign not only in point of birth, but also in point of ideas, notions and sympathies. In very considerable degree, as has been said, it is "anti-Protestant, anti-temperance, anti-Sabbath, anti-Bible." A report of the Howard Society of London states that "74 per cent. of the Irish discharged convicts have found their way to the United States." In this connection let me cite three or four facts from the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW of January, 1884. "The Rhode Island Workhouse and House of Correction had received up to the beginning of the year 1883, 6,022 persons on commitment, less than a quarter of whom were born of American parents, and more than half of whom were of Irish parents." If we had no rum and no Irishmen we could tear down half our prisons and shut up three-quarters of our almshouses. "The Massachusetts Reformatory for Women gives the following statement for the year ending September, 1881 : Out of 182 inmates in that year, only 33 (18 per cent.) were born of American parents." "During the year ending June, 1882, 680 discharged convicts applied to the Prison Association of New York for aid. Of these 680, only 144 (less than 22 per cent.) were of American parentage." In estimating the vitality of Christianity in our own country we shall have therefore to take distinct account of this immense influx of immigrants, and the bad infection with which so much of it, particularly the Irish ingredient, is tainted. If, with a stream of sewage from north-western Europe discharging among us its reeking and continuous filth, it can appear that the current of American society is really becoming purer, and the faith of Jesus gaining ground, very intense must be the vitalizing and defecating energy at work among us.

And now as to the actual tokens which Christianity is at present giving of its own vigor, and the measurements which have been successively taken of its moving tide. Of course space admits of no detailed treatment of this matter. The facts that I cite will be rather in the nature of example. The authorities are numerous and accessible. The facts that I adduce are stated, or if not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stated, paralleled, in such works as Storr's "Divine Origin of Christianity Indicated by its Historic Effects," Brace's "Gesta Christi," Uhlhorn's "Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism," or Dorchester's "Problem of Religious Progress." I mention these books as indicating that the subject is one that has received detailed and scholarly treatment. The appliances are at hand for making ourselves personally conversant with the matter. There is no more necessity for groping in the dark in reference to the general trend of Christianity, than in regard to the flux of the winds, the drift of the tides, the trend of the stars.

As to any suspicion that there is going forward in society a process of moral deterioration, such suspicion is historically unfounded and is explicable on three grounds: the avidity of newspapers, which stand in electric connection with the remotest quarters of the country and make a point of giving largest prominence to whatever will satisfy an appetite for the sensational; meager acquaintance with the moral condition of society fifty, a hundred, or a thousand years ago; and an elevated moral sentiment that takes offense now at what in times past would have been accounted as tolerable or even unexceptionable. Writing of a period a hundred years back, a recent contributor to "Blackwood's Magazine" says, "It was an age when delicate young women of the best blood and best manners in the land talked with a coarseness which editors of the nineteenth century can represent only by asterisks." It is part of the history of the old church at Andover, Mass., that the chief causes of discipline for 125 years were fornication and drunkenness. Theodore Parker, writing in regard to the fathers of New England, says, "It is easier to praise them for virtues they did not possess than to judge them with fairness and discrimination." As illustrating the coarse intemperance of the times among Christian people, he states that it is recorded in the probate office that "in 1678, at the funeral of the widow of John Norton, one of the ministers of the First Church, in Boston, above fifty gallons of wine were consumed by the mourners. Just two hundred years ago at the funeral of the pastor of the church at Ipswich, Mass., there were consumed one barrel of wine and two barrels of cider." If this occurred at the funeral of an old and loved pastor, we can infer what excesses would be habitual on occasions less stated and solemn. In a historical survey of the Congregational churches of one of the New England States, it is related that "not very far

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the period of the Revolution, several councils were held in one of the towns where the people were trying to get rid of a minister who was often the worse for liquor, even in the pulpit, and once at least at the communion table! but some of the neighboring ministers stood by him, and the people had to endure him till his death." This reminds me of the case of one who not above fifty years ago was deacon of a prominent church in western Massachusetts, who had habitually a drunken spree as an after-effect of tasting the wine at the sacrament, but whose irregularities were not considered by the church sufficient ground for ecclesiastical impeachment. Rev. Dr. Leonard Woods said, "I remember when I could reckon up among my acquaintances forty ministers who were intemperate." A gentleman, in writing to a Boston paper of about that date, said, "I have a list of 123 intemperate deacons in Massachusetts, 43 of whom became sots."

A word or two will be in place in regard to church attendance and church membership. Dr. Griffin became pastor of the Park Street Church, Boston, in 1811. So unpopular was it to be seen in attendance upon an evangelical church that, as Dr. Nehemiah Adams relates, gentlemen of culture and standing who ventured into Dr. Griffin's church Sunday evenings, attracted by the reports of his genius and eloquence, went in partial disguise, sitting in obscure corners, with caps drawn over their faces and wrappers turned inside out." That was in Boston less than eighty years ago! I find that in New York City less than sixty years ago a mob prevented the holding of a meeting planned by Dr. Spring and others for promoting the better observance of the Sabbath. In the year 1800 there were in the United States 3,030 evangelical churches; in 1850, 43,072; in 1870, 70,148; and in 1880, 97,090. A gain of 27,000 in ten years, ending in 1880, and this is what the critics have been pleased to call an effete Protestantism! As gleaned from the "Year-books" and "Church Minutes," the number of communicants in evangelical churches in the United States has been as follows: In 1800, 364,000; in 1850, 3,529,000; in 1870, 6,673,000; and in 1880, 10,065,000. Of course during all this time there was an immense increase in population, but the increase in church membership a good deal more than kept pace with that of population. Taking the whole country through, there was in 1800 one evangelical communicant to every 14½ inhabitants; in 1850, one to every 6½; in 1870, one to every 5¾; and in 1880, one to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every 5. Even during the period since 1850, in which materialism and rationalism have been subjecting Protestantism to so severe a strain, while the increase in population has been 116 per cent., the increase in communicants of Protestant evangelical churches in the United States has been 185 per cent.

The same pronounced drift Christianwards evinces itself if we consider the matter of American colleges and college students. Writing in 1810, Bishop Meade, of Virginia, said, "I can truly say that in every educated young man in Virginia whom I met I expected to find a skeptic, if not an avowed infidel." When Dr. Dwight became president of Yale College, in 1745, only five of the students were church members. In the early part of Dr. Appleton's presidency of Bowdoin, only one student was a professing Christian. In 1830, according to returns obtained from American colleges, 26 per cent. of the students were professing Christians; in 1850, 38 per cent.; in 1865, 46 per cent.; in 1880, according to the Year-book of the Young Men's Christian Association, out of 12,063 students in 65 colleges, 6,081, or a little more than half, were professors of religion. An American college is one of the very safest places in which a young man can be put. And it is by such steps as these that the religion of Jesus Christ is undertaking to die out from the respect and affection of our American people! So far from Christianity betraying the first symptoms of exhaustion, there has been no time since the Jordan baptism of Jesus when Christianity has moved with such gigantic strides, and put forth efforts so vigorous and herculean, as during these years of our own century when the disciples of Voltaire and the imitators of Paine have been most agile in their production of obituaries and accumulation of embalming spices.

It is during this time, in fact within the last forty years of it, that there have sprung up all our Young Men's Christian Associations, with organizations extending North and South, East and West, in North America and South, Europe, Asia, the Sandwich Islands, Australia, Madagascar. A strange way it is that Christianity has of dying! Our American Sunday schools, too, are all of them a growth of the present century, numbering only half a million pupils in 1830, with an increase of six millions in the fifty years following. It is during the last eighty years, likewise, that the American church has shown its colossal vigor in the inauguration of its missionary enterprises. Beginning with the second

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decade of our century with a contribution of $200,000, the total amount raised for home and foreign missions in this country up to 1880 was $129,000,000; and 88 per cent. of that was raised during the last thirty years, the period during which Christianity is supposed to have betrayed accumulating symptoms of debility and senility. 70,000 mission communicants in 1830 had become 210,000 in 1850 and 850,000 in 1880. All of this, to say nothing of other organizations of evangelization and amelioration, the Bible Society, the Tract Society and the rest, which have sprung from the fecund soil of our own magnificent Gospel century.

Such are the facts. Like the Scribes and Pharisees would you see a sign from Jesus? There are the signs. The books are accessible, the facts are verifiable. To him who thinks he knows it all, and is going through life under cover of the impression that the world is tired of Jesus, and that the intelligence of the age has passed the defunct body of our senile faith over into the hands of the undertaker, let it be recommended to review the matter, and to treat it with the candid and studious respect due to a cause that in point of vitality, growth, vigor and productiveness is comparable with none that solicits the attention or engages the interest of mankind.

C. H. PARKHURST.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROHIBITION IN PRACTICE.

THE lull in temperance enthusiasm, caused by the disgust resulting from political prohibition, will not be wholly disadvantageous, if the opportunity be improved to scrutinize anew the soundness of accepted principles, to reform lines of action, to discover and fortify positions that all will defend, to withdraw from indefensible points, to utilize weapons in our armory. The danger to temperance to-day is from the Prohibition Party. The advocates of temperance should everywhere insist upon what Dr. Porter and Judge Davis insisted so strenuously before election, and which was so strenuously denied—that Mr. St. John and the Prohibition Convention do not represent the great prohibition cause. The reason for prohibition stands now exactly where it has always stood, and it will be a sad thing if the folly of a few foolish women and a few bad men should blind us to the fact that the wise women and the honorable men who compose the great army of prohibitionists were as stanch to the other principles of Republicanism as they are to temperance, and fought against the prostitution of prohibition to the Democratic Party as loyally as was ever fought the battle of human rights in any other form.

There needs no sense, no system, no concerted action to do mischief. To do good often requires all three. Skill and study, the wealth and the toil of years, go to the rearing of a stately edifice, which barbarous hands, with a little dynamite wrapped in a ragged shawl, may destroy in a moment. For those whose only aim is destruction, there is no occasion to study principles or to take note of tendencies; but those who desire the elevation of character, should watch progress and observe carefully the result of experiment, for their own guidance in further action. All who are in earnest, making fight, not for their own prominence or emolument chiefly, not for love of fighting, but to remove temptation and to build up

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national temperance, cannot fail to discern that there are a great many of their number who believe that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors, would be utterly futile if it were accomplished, is purely visionary and impracticable, and is moreover too antagonistic to the spirit of the Constitution to be even seriously attempted. While, therefore, this is a proper subject of argument and discussion, one would say that it was not a proper dividing line, because it would divide the advocates of temperance. What we want is a line sharply drawn between those who wish society to be self-governing and temperate, and those who wish it to be the slave of low vice and intemperance—massing and marshaling all the forces of the one against all the temptations of the other.

If a prohibitory Constitutional amendment be insisted on as the issue, the cause of intemperance will gladly accept it, and the victory of temperance will be indefinitely postponed. Anything that calls off attention from present dangers to remote dangers will be warmly welcomed, however serious the future danger may be. A contingent national prohibition is not half so menacing to a nuisance as an urgent, well enforced district law. Many temperance men believe that while the Government has a legal right to prohibit in the District of Columbia and in the Territories, it has no moral right, and it would be a stretch of power to the very limits of tyranny, to do so while prohibition is not yet enacted by the States. If the sentiment of the Territories is not yet educated up to the point of prohibiting for themselves, it is more in accordance with the American idea to await the development of such sentiment from within, than to force prohibition upon the Territory from without. Angry and disappointed Republicans should remember that this question was ably argued during the last Presidential campaign by leading prohibitionists, and nowhere more ably argued than by a woman before the Woman's Convention at St. Louis. Leading prohibitionists, male and female, maintained against their own adherents, that the American idea of personal liberty is a more sacred trust than personal temperance, and that a man must often be left free to do wrong rather than forced to do right. This can be made an issue in temperance action as well as in temperance discussion; but as such, it will divide and weaken the advocates of temperance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and will give a longer lease of life to measures that permit and promote intemperance.

The intemperance of some temperance people is causing the sober element of the Temperance Party to scrutinize most closely the paths before us, to see whether some that have seemed new and narrow, be not, really, disguised but direct avenues into the old, broad, familiar ways that lead to destruction. There are many temperate citizens who believe that while we are waiting "in the use of means" for all men to be educated to self-restraint, which is temperance, and for public sentiment to widen sufficiently to enact and to enforce that prohibition which individual men may not be strong enough to enforce upon themselves, society has the right, and necessarily therefore is under obligation, to protect its members by enacting and enforcing such laws as it can command; and that it should restrain, by the severest effective taxation, a trade which it cannot yet wholly abolish. Among these men are the most successful practical philanthropists of the day; yet against them, professional temperance men use language as intemperate as any that ever emanated from the vat of the brewer or the worm of the still. The "Temperance Review," "a family newspaper," thus speaks of a proposal to tax liquor-sellers five hundred dollars a year:

"Great divines, both Catholic and Protestant, make haste to sell the right to damn men for five hundred dollars per year. . . . Men who profess to be commissioned to labor with Jesus Christ to destroy the works of the devil, deliberately continue to let the devil open his by-ways to hell for five hundred dollars a way. And for what purpose? . . . Every drunkard shall have an opportunity to get drunk and beat and maim, shoot and stamp, if for the privilege of making men insane they pay five hundred dollars cash. God says, 'Thou shalt not;' the great lights of St. Paul [Minnesota] say, 'Thou shalt' for five hundred dollars a year."

It is to be hoped that the editor of this family newspaper wrote in the imbecility of intoxication. It is far more appalling that a sober mind should have produced these words with malice aforethought, than that a drunken mind should have hiccoughed them out half unconsciously. Inebriety would mean nothing but inebriety; sobriety would mean a habit of heedless and harmful speaking, a steady bent to total depravity. The leader of this class, the Presidential candidate of the Prohibition Party, evinced in his public speeches the same fatal inability to see facts, to comprehend

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the meaning and the use of words. He averred that the Republican Party desires to make "the liquor traffic permanent in this country, to the end that the States and Territories may derive a revenue therefrom." Only a brain sodden with liquor or dull from some congenital defect could honestly make a statement that presents this total abstinence from truth. He showed an equal inability to cope with the English language when he declared that no man can run a saloon without a permit from the United States. He might just as well say that no man can smuggle whisky without a permit from the United States. The Government lays a tax on the saloons, imposes a fine upon smugglers. It might burn the saloons, it might hang the smugglers, if the popular sentiment could be embodied in legislation to that effect. If it did, it would not be a "permit" to the saloons and the smugglers, but it would be just as much a permit as it is under the present tax, only the conditions of the permit would be a little harder. Yet persons who profess to be working for humanity resist the attempt to restrain the liquor-traffic as strenuously as if it were an attempt to extend it. Misled by the word license, which is a term of restriction, they combat license as if it meant non-restriction. The Supreme Court of Michigan has lately rendered a decision declaring that "the imposition of a tax . . . . . is not a license but a restraint." This is no matter of opinion merely; it is a matter of experiment and of evidence. The family newspaper accuses great divines of hastening to sell the right to damn men for five hundred dollars a year. One of these great divines is the Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D., of New York. Dr. Crosby is a man whose opinion will not be sneered at even by prohibitionists. He publicly advised votes for St. John. Religious newspapers in New York testify that his organization for the prevention of crime has been the most effective in the city. Constantly impeded by the low state of public sentiment in the community and among the public officials, his society shut up 1,790 places in the first year of its existence. Four years ago every liquor saloon had its front door open on Sunday; now it is closed and barred. Dr. Crosby is said to be the best hated man by the liquor-dealers in the city of New York. Such a man cannot be set aside as a brewer, a rum-apologist, a friend of publicans and sinners, and Dr. Crosby says that he considers the "prohibition doctrine both a blunder and a farce." He voted for Mr. St. John, because "he cannot legislate, if elected

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President. He can only execute. The prohibition sentiments of St. John are, therefore, no hinderance to my voting for him."

It is a little extraordinary to see the reverend gentleman so publicly and needlessly giving himself a slap in the face, on the plea that it will not hurt; but the only point that concerns us is, that this eminent practical temperance worker counts prohibition, even with a small *p*, a blunder and a farce. The political prohibitionist takes the ground that all the by-ways to hell are open unless they are closed by his patent lock. The great divine points to the 1,790 shops actually shut, but the prohibitionist refuses to see them, because they are shut by high license and not by prohibition. The devil, of whom the prohibitionist speaks so familiarly and confidently, undoubtedly lends a hand, but it is as the father of lies, not as the father of liquor.

The same high authority that I have cited in the decision of the Michigan Supreme Court declares that "prohibition has been tried in this State. Failing, however, to accomplish the result desired, the people have resorted to the more usual means of regulation and taxation." The result is matter of fact, not of opinion. In one place where there were twenty-five saloons under prohibition, there were but nine under tax. In Detroit over 500 were closed out by tax law. In Ann Arbor, under prohibition in 1872, there were seventy saloons and breweries; there are now only thirty-two, and only sixty-four in the whole county. Magistrates and sheriffs tell us "there is not half the disorder there was under prohibition." Dr. Dio Lewis, who will not be considered an advocate of intemperance, says:

"I have recently been out to the Rocky Mountains, and on my way East I got off the train at several of the large cities, and among other things made inquiry into the practical benefits the public had received from the enactment of prohibition laws. In places where I had been told an intoxicating drink could not be obtained for love or money at any store, I saw men reeling on the streets in an almost helpless state of drunkenness. In Iowa City, where prohibition is supposed to be enforced, I saw from seventy-five to one hundred kegs of beer delivered on trucks from a brewery. I asked a resident of this place, 'How is it that such an open violation of the law and such a bold defiance of public sentiment is permitted?' 'Well,' said he, 'the brewer has given us to understand that any one who interfered with his private affairs took his life in his hand, and no one has yet appeared who has had sufficient courage to enforce the Law. This brewer means what he says, and I don't know any one among us willing to become a martyr to the cause of prohibition.' For many reasons I believe in temperance, but am of the opinion that prohibition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is simply a wild theory ; that in practice it has not met the claims of its supporters, and as an aid to the cause of temperance it is a failure."

In Minnesota, under high license—in the very State in which our family newspaper was dedicating its great divines to the devil's work—the five hundred and forty-seven saloons of a single city were in one year reduced to two hundred and seventy-four. The increase of the tax from one hundred to five hundred dollars, not only nearly trebled their payment to the city's treasury, but swept away nearly half the saloons. The police department testify that the effective policing of the city has become much easier in consequence ; that the saloons closed were generally of the worst character ; that there has been a discernible decrease of drunkenness, a large falling off in misdemeanors attributable to drunkenness, and a marked improvement in the good order of the city. Our family newspaper calls this "the high license craze let loose." There certainly is a craze, but it is not on the part of the great divines who advocated a course that has closed half the saloons of Minneapolis.

In Illinois a similar result has been reached. The saloons of Chicago were suddenly forced into paying a $500 tax. Under the old system they yielded to the city a revenue of $400,000. With the new license they yielded a revenue of $1,500,000. In nineteen other cities 733 liquor-shops yielded a public revenue of $89,950. With high license, the shops decreased to 468, but yielded a public revenue of $253,000.

Was any wrong done in forcing the saloons to contribute this sum toward mitigating the poverty and defraying the expense that temperance sentiment was not strong enough to prevent? More than this money, wrung from them to replenish the coffers which their trade tends constantly to exhaust, infinitely more significant than any money, is the testimony that throughout the State the total number of saloons was diminished by from three to four thousand. All these by-ways to hell were closed, and not one was opened. Arrests fell off, and there was 30 per cent. less of drunkenness, yet the "Temperance Review" accuses the clergy whose action helped on this beneficent result of deliberately contriving to let the devil open these ways to hell for five hundred dollars a way. This is the very dead-drunkenness of slander.

In Maine, the original prohibition State, a close and careful inspection, by a temperance man, so late as March 30 of the pres-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ent year, indicates that it is time for our great divines and for all who love their country and desire the improvement of humanity, to re-examine the foundation of their faith. For fifty years, says this report, Maine has been a temperance State. The Washingtonian movement originated a great number of total-abstinence societies. Licenses had been granted with discretion, and selling without license had been heavily punished. Finally the Legislature, under the influence of the growing temperance sentiment, forbade the granting of licenses, and liquor was practically driven out of half the townships of Maine and into dark corners of the other half. Open temptation ceased to exist. In 1851 the Maine law was passed, which, for medicinal and mechanical purposes, established State agencies and local agencies in every town, thus forcing rum and whisky into many towns from which they had long been banished. The actual result is, that liquor is sold to all who wish to obtain it, in nearly every town in the State. Enforcement of the law seems to have little effect. For the past six years the city of Bangor has practically enjoyed free rum. In more than one hundred places liquor is sold, and no attempt has been made to enforce the law. In Bath, Lewiston, Augusta, and other cities, no real difficulty is experienced in procuring liquor. In Portland enforcement of the law has been faithfully attempted, yet the liquor traffic flourishes for all classes, from the highest to the lowest. The prohibitionists pursued a rumseller for five years. They made him pay fines more than forty times, and finally got him into jail; and then his brother carried on the business at the old stand, and when, after a protracted siege, he was forced to retire, his brother-in-law took his place, and keeps it to this day. In a journey last summer for hundreds of miles through the cities and through the scattered villages and hamlets of Maine, the almost universal testimony was, "You can get liquor enough for bad purposes in bad places, but you cannot get it for good purposes in good places."

This is not decisive against prohibition. Much is accomplished when the tempter cannot sit at the corners of the streets, openly tempting the weak, but is forced to hide in the dark. What makes against prohibition is, that in the opinion of many of the most earnest total-abstinence men, the original Maine Law State, after thirty years of prohibition, is no more a temperance State now than it was before prohibition was introduced. In Kansas, where

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the most stringent prohibition has been enacted and has had the inestimable advantage of Gov. St. John's fostering care, Dr. Cardner testifies that the drug-stores are little more than rum-shops, and that their number is astonishing. In Pittsburg, a thrifty little town of 4,000 people, he counted fifteen drug-stores and twenty doctors' signs on the main street. They scarcely pretend to keep medicines, save of the simplest kind, "but they sell any quantity of liquor. . . . I found this to be the principal business of the doctors and druggists in all the parts of Kansas I visited, and from my inquiries of others I am convinced that it is the case throughout the State." Neither the reason of wise and honest prohibitionists, nor the rant of wild and dishonest ones, can alter the nature of these facts or disprove their grave significance. In the face of such facts, the claim of any class of men to a special Divine revelation on this subject cannot be successfully established. When the temperance reviewer quotes the Ruler of the Universe as saying "Thou shalt not," he is forced to leave his quotation swinging in the air. "Thou shalt not"—what? Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn, says the Bible. Three gallons of whisky are made from a bushel of corn, and the distiller may affirm that God says, "Thou shalt not forbid the manufacture of whisky." This would be a thoroughly unwarrantable interpretation, but no more unwarrantable than any interpretation of any Scripture into "Thou shalt not lay a tax of five hundred dollars on the sale of whisky." God—the God of the Bible, the God of conscience, the God of human society—says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." When the prohibitionist charges the great divines who are closing the doors of temptation with deliberately contriving to let the devil open them, he is violating the Divine Law formulated in the Bible, incorporated in the human heart, inwrought into the body politic.

Great divines in other parts of the world take the same view of the temperance action that is condemned as devilish in the great divines of Minnesota. Dr. A. W. Thorold, Bishop of Rochester, England, for the past three years has spent his annual holiday in helping to lay the foundation of the [Episcopal] Church Temperance Society. From Maine to Oregon, he bears witness to "the genuine and profound enthusiasm felt by the country in the cause of temperance." He has addressed public temperance meetings at Buffalo, St. Louis, Kansas City, Denver, Salt Lake City, Detroit,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

St. Paul, Minneapolis, Faribault, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Baltimore, New York, and the University of Virginia. Necessarily without partisanship, without claim to any five hundred dollars to be secured by damning men, and therefore with no temptation to aid in this fiends' work, what is the testimony of this divine? He says:

"The subject is uppermost in our thoughts because every one has sympathy with it. It is complicated because each man has his own nostrum and dislikes his neighbor's. It is prejudiced in the eyes of moderate men by intolerance and exaggeration, and it is not made purer by being mingled with politics. The duty of the friends of temperance is plain. They must combine their forces on one solid basis of total abstainers and of those who use intoxicants temperately. Instead of pressing for more legislation, they must first put in force what they have. Restriction is more practicable than prohibition, and restriction is best effected by the raising of the price of licenses. . . . If we in England could only get the legislation you have got in the most of your States for prohibiting the sale of liquors on Sunday and to minors and to persons who have had sufficient already, we should have enough legislation to last us fifty years."

It may be questioned whether we have legislation enough to last fifty years, but we have enough for the present. Legislation is already far in advance of public sentiment; too far, as we have seen, for it to feel the spur of public sentiment. Of a little town in Massachusetts, the citizens, in town-meeting assembled, voted for prohibition and against license, by a vote of 83 to 1; and they appropriated five hundred dollars to enforce the law. In that village were opened, during the ensuing year, three houses where liquor was sold; where any one could, and many did, freely buy, without attempt at let or hinderance, or prosecution. What could more law do for them? Public sentiment was strong enough to enact law, but not strong enough to enforce it when enacted; strong enough to forbid selling, but not strong enough to prevent drinking.

It is appalling to see well-meaning persons turn away from present work which, though difficult, is not impossible, to future work whose impossibility is not less because not immediately demonstrable. Instead of bringing the community up to the execution of laws already enacted, by machinery already existing, we clamor for new laws, for a Constitutional amendment, for the woman's ballot. In a prohibitory State, shortly after the November election, I heard a clergyman, who had seen, apparently, in the whole campaign nothing but a Prohibitory amendment to the Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution, deliver a sermon on the prevalence of drunkenness in his own city, the crimes consequent, and the great neglect of duty in the enforcement of liquor laws! If the appetite of drunken men is too strong, if the conscience of temperate men is too weak, for the laws that inclose them at home, what is to be effected by a future law at the center of government a thousand miles away? The one enemy to be grappled with is a consuming thirst and a weak will in the individual man. Few weapons are farther off or more ineffectual than an amendment to the national Constitution. What is wanted is an amendment to the man's own constitution. Far more practical and pointed is the truth contained in the pithy philosophy, that the only way to reform a man is to reform his grandmother. We may find this hard, but less hard than to reform a man by act of Congress or by a three-fourths vote of the States. The grandmothers of the drunkards of the future are closer to us than a Constitutional amendment that shall prohibit and prevent the manufacture of intoxicating liquors.

Here women can lay hold on temperance with a mighty hand. The president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union claims that the enforcement ballot of the nation must be woman's because —because women as a class are free from the appetite for drink! This is foreordained failure. Not one step is ever made by resisting somebody's else temptation. Man's appetite, pitted against woman's muscle, will always win. What women cannot accomplish by moral power they cannot accomplish by physical power, because men are stronger than women. A ballot is not might, any more than a bank-note is money. The bank-note, by common agreement, passes for money and is a convenient device. The ballot, by the common consent of the highest civilization, stands for physical power, and is even more convenient. It would be very clumsy to fight out every election, but voting it out would be of no use except to show that it could be fought out if necessary. A low civilization in the Democratic Party in 1860 refused to let the ballot stand for physical power, but found after four years of fighting that physical power was what the ballot meant. A very low form of civilization in the Democratic Party in Albany, in November, 1884, threatened to make another trial of the same kind, which would have had the same result, with even more emphasis. Women make a great mistake in assuming that a ballot is but a piece of paper, which a woman can drop into a box

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just as easily as a man. A ballot means a bullet, and a bayonet, forced marches, digging trenches, sleeping on the ground, carrying a knapsack. Physical force, whenever needed, must be administered by men. The physical power of woman is not even a factor in the political problem. In our civilization she never has been, and she never will be, called upon to lift her hand in the enforcement of law, any more than if she did not possess a hand. No access of woman voters would bring any access of material strength to the nation. No access of woman prohibitionists will lend any material strength to the enforcement of the law. Whatever women cannot do by moral power, by spiritual energy, they cannot do at all. As long as men will to drink, drink they will. Women do effective temperance work just so far as they free men from the appetite for drink, and no farther. Prohibition is valuable just so far as it helps to free men from the appetite for drink, and not one step farther. The only preventive of drunkenness is character. The only remedy for drunkenness is character—and possibly, they now say, cocaine! The formation and development of character is woman's business. The cure of souls is her mission work. The child that is built up strongly within, increasing in wisdom as he increases in stature, disciplined, self-controlled, under the reign of law, will never be a drunkard. Thus to build up the human being is no easy work; but it is an easier work than, after he has shambled or thrust his way up into a violent, indolent, self-indulgent, weak-willed adult, to keep him from continually lapsing into degradation. Whatever can be done to shield this unhappy creature from temptation, without trenching upon the personal liberty of the unfallen, it is the eager desire of all temperate persons to do; but when that is done the hardest work remains—to build up the man himself, to supplement the defects of his training, to substitute healthy for diseased tissue, to change weakness into strength. This is hard; but if it is impossible, then all temperance work is futile. Societies, pledges, platforms, legislation, are worth only their effect on the drunkard's tissues, on the drunkard's will. Audiences gathered, newspapers circulated, towns visited, are no test whatever of work done. Men rescued from low habits, children reared to high tastes, an orderly and elevated social life—by that sign alone we conquer.

The one hope of an unrestricted liquor traffic is in the Democratic Party, and the one hope of the Democratic Party is in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prohibition Party. Before temperance as a public sentiment, as a moral principle, as a manly habit, the saloons must go down. As a political plank, as an election contest, as a Constitutional amendment, temperance is a mere diversion from the main issue, is not feared, is indeed desired, by the Democratic Party. There is not a State in which they do not hail it as a relief from impending, immediate danger. Intemperance apprehends no harm to its craft from the Prohibition Party, while absolutism is always endangered by the triumph of the Republican Party. The Democratic Party, with its principles outspoken and its record read of all men, has no chance before the people. In the South, where the Democratic Party has entrenched itself by force, political prohibition is not suffered to move the wing or open the mouth or peep. In Georgia three-fourths of the counties enforce prohibition; in Georgia, of a total vote of 143,610, the prohibition candidate received 195. But in the North, where the Democratic Party is weak, it cherishes prohibition like a nursing mother, and its caresses are returned with a collusive fondness. Straight as if winged from a Democratic bow, the prohibition arrow flew to the States where the Democratic Party had the best show for victory. Torpid in all the States where it could harm the Democratic Party and where it could not vitally harm the Republican Party, it was active in those States where even its small power could turn the tide against Republicans. What has been done may be done again, but it will be better understood. Prohibitionists may continue to be Democratic allies, but they will not be so well disguised Democrats. "God and home and native land" will always have a suspicious tang, and even woman's instinct will need to show its credentials when it appears on the stump bearing the St. John sort of "home" in a charger.

The logic of the universe is not disturbed by our refusal to recognize it. It amused Madame de Pompadour to play at political genius, to sit in councils, to dismiss and appoint generals, to direct battles, to act as if she were a great man instead of a lost woman; but the eternal procession of cause and effect was not for one moment delayed by her pretty airs, or deflected by her self-deception. Rather was she, unconscious, swept into the somber funeral march. None the less for her, all the more for her, came confusion and dismay to France. The royal dynasty went down to rise no more, and not the least of its fate-compelling and immortal infamies was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a puny hand clutching for one brief hour the scepter of control. More allied to those virtuous women who are piously paving the drunkard's hell with their good intentions, was the unhappy Isabella, who in thorough love and loyalty bent the neck of Spain to the yoke of the Inquisition. Religious devotion, conscientious conviction, single-hearted patriotism, availed nothing against the eternal law of the universe into which she was born. Just as fatally as if she had been its mortal foe, she fastened upon her beloved realm a burden too heavy to be borne, under which it sank into a stupor of centuries, from which it has never yet arisen.

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EXTRADITION OF DYNAMITE CRIMINALS.

We seek an answer to the question, Ought the persons guilty of such crimes as have been recently committed in Europe by the use of dynamite, to be extradited in response to a regular demand of one government upon another? Let us ask first, What are the general grounds of extradition? These are found in the duty of a state to protect itself, and in its duty to aid in all proper ways in protecting human society against flagrant crimes. It is obviously for the interest of each nation to prevent its territory from becoming the resort of criminals from other lands, and also to bring back for punishment its own criminals who may have fled to foreign parts. It is for the advantage of every people, it is conducive to the peace and order of human society, that criminals should not be permitted to escape from justice by simply crossing a frontier. Especially since the means of rapid communication between countries have so multiplied, has it become essential to the safety of political societies that those guilty of grave offenses should find no refuge on foreign soil. No enlightened state can refuse to recognize the importance of having justice maintained everywhere, and the duty of states to strengthen one another in proper attempts to punish acts that are universally considered flagrant crimes. Accordingly, of late years extradition treaties have rapidly increased in number, until now the murderer can hardly find on the earth a place obscure enough to hide him from the pursuit of justice. Even without treaties, states occasionally surrender criminals, and some eminent publicists hold that it is their duty to surrender them, whether they have extradition treaties or not.

But while public opinion almost universally favors the extradition of criminals, it now as generally opposes the surrender of men for political offenses. Why is this? In many cases there can be no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agreement among different nations as to the moral quality of what is charged upon a man as a political offense. An act that one government would consider such, may be most meritorious in the eyes of another government. A deed of righteous opposition to the last King of Naples might have been branded by him as a political crime, but commended by England and by us as a patriotic and noble deed. We could not give back into the power of such a tyrant a hero whom he might demand as a political criminal in order to execute him for action that we admire. An attempt of a saint to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience might be, and has been, treason in some lands; but how could we ever surrender such a saint as a criminal for making that attempt? So-called political offenses are often offenses only against some particular form of constitution, and not against government in general, not against society, as are crimes at common law. Although Grotius recommended the extradition of men charged with political offenses, and in former days they were often surrendered, by general consent the refusal to extradite them is in our times justly regarded as necessary.

The men that commit what are called in these days dynamite crimes, attempt to shelter themselves against extradition under this principle of exempting political offenders. They say that their deeds are all committed with a political aim. They strive to assassinate sovereigns and police-officers in order to reform governments. They attempt to blow up London Bridge and the Tower in order by terror to compel the British Government to be more lenient or more just to the Irish. If reminded that they are slaying innocent women and children in their work of destruction, they may profess to regret the fact, but say that this is only a necessary incident of the warfare they are waging, and that in all wars and revolutions unhappily the innocent have to suffer with the guilty. Our inquiry is, whether this plea is valid, whether these men guilty of crimes that shock the moral sense of the race are to have the immunities of political offenders if they flee from the scene of their iniquities to some foreign land. I believe their plea for exemption from extradition should be treated as invalid. Take the crime that can with most plausibility be called political, the assassination by dynamite of the sovereign. This may be committed with a political aim, and may have a political effect. But in all civilized lands assassination has been considered utterly unjustifia-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ble, even in time of open war. The Roman consuls sent back to Pyrrhus the servant that offered to poison him. The man that resorts to assassination is entitled to no immunities. The moral sense of mankind brands him as a foul murderer, whom all nations should rejoice to bring to justice. It is incompatible with the safety of society that a political end should be sought by such means. None of the reasons above given for granting asylum to political offenders is applicable here. Would any government have declined to surrender the assassin of President Garfield? Dr. Wharton says no civilized government would have refused to deliver up the assassin of President Lincoln. The present Earl of Derby said in the House of Commons in 1866, "It is monstrous to say that if any private person is assassinated in the streets of Paris, and the murderer escapes to England, he may be punished; but that if the person so assassinated is invested with any political character, then the offense becomes a political offense, and the law of England declares that he shall not be given up to justice." An English commission, composed of some of the ablest jurists in the realm, including Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, Lord Selborne, and Sir Fitz-James Stephen, in 1877 reported in favor of surrendering persons claiming to be political offenders who sought to attain their ends by foul crimes like arson or assassination. A Belgian act of 1856 excludes from political crimes the attempt to murder, assassinate, or poison the chief of a government, or any member of his family. A provision subjecting a person guilty of such a deed to extradition has been inserted in at least nineteen treaties negotiated in the past twenty-six years.* Among them is the treaty of 1882 between the United States and Belgium. Our Government has thus solemnly recorded its views on that subject.

If assassination of officials should not be regarded as a simply political act, much less can those other wanton and useless crimes that are alleged to have a political end, such as the destruction of property and life by explosions of dynamite in underground railways and public buildings, be so regarded. No man of sense can suppose for an instant that they will have any such political effect as the perpetrators profess to desire. If so shadowy and slight a political element is recognized as lifting such crimes to the dignity of unextraditable political offenses, we may expect a rapid increase of

* For list of such treaties negotiated down to 1879, see Bernard, "*De l'Extradition*," ii. 390.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

murderers and robbers, who will plead that their iniquities are all committed with a view to frightening the Government into some concessions. Even if there were a state of civil war, or an outbreak of organized insurrection, most of the attempts of the dynamite criminals would be outside the pale of acts lawful in war, and would deserve to be ranked with the poisoning of wells and the distribution of infected clothing. But committed in a time of profound peace they deserve to be considered not as political offenses, but simply as most flagrant crimes, the perpetrators of which all governments should gladly aid in bringing to condign punishment as *hostes humani generis.*

The Institute of International Law, composed of a large number of the most eminent publicists of Europe, at the session of 1880 in Oxford, formulated their opinions on the subject of extradition in a series of statements, from which are the following:

"Extradition ought not to take place for political offenses. The state on which requisition is made has the sovereign right of determining, according to the circumstances, whether the act on account of which extradition is claimed has or has not a political character. In judging these facts, it ought to be inspired by the two following ideas: (*a*) Acts which unite in themselves all the characteristics of crimes at common law (assassinations, arson, theft, etc.) should not be excepted from extradition on the sole ground of the political intention of the perpetrators. (*b*) To judge of acts committed in the course of a political rebellion or an assassination or a civil war, one must ask if they would or would not be excused by the usages of war."

These statements are so just and wise that public opinion cannot fail to sanction them.

JAMES B. ANGELL.

THE question under discussion relates primarily to persons who in any country are guilty of the offense of attempting to blow up public buildings with dynamite or any other explosive, and who escape to this country before they are arrested; and secondarily to persons in this country that may have aided and abetted them. It is asked whether there ought to be international treaties for the extradition of the first class, and what, incidentally, ought to be done in regard to the second class.

That individuals holding no public authority derived from a regular and established, or from a revolutionary or insurrectionary,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government, shall not be permitted to carry on war in any form, upon any pretext, has long been one of the maxims of public law. Civilized society is founded upon a code of public morality, which forbids the idea that private individuals should find any immunity for acts of violence against persons or property or public order, in any real or supposed grievance they or others may undertake to avenge or to redress. The sole justification that can exist for violence of any kind against the peace and safety of society as it is constituted in any country, is to be found in the fact that there is in progress a revolution of such proportions that it can openly bestow upon individuals some kind of authority or commission to do those acts that involve destruction of property, loss of life, and interruption of order. Aside from all the doctrines of treason or treason-felony, aside from all the legal principles that uphold the existing order of things in any civilized country, the law of sound morals, as well as public safety, forbids the idea that private individuals can be permitted to usurp the function of carrying on war, or of doing acts of war, or of doing acts of malicious injury, from any motive whatever. All this I assume to be perfectly plain and undeniable ; and therefore my general answer to the first branch of the question is, without any hesitation, in the affirmative. There ought to be treaties for the extradition of the class of offenders comprehended in the first category above described.

But perhaps I can best make some practical suggestions, by pointing out the mode in which this desirable object should be reached. In the first place, each country should define, by careful legislation, the precise character of the crime of which it expects other countries to take practical cognizance, so far as to arrest, examine, and, if sufficient grounds exist, to surrender, offenders that have escaped from the one country into the other. This new offense, which has come about in these very recent years, in consequence of the extreme facility for terrible mischief afforded by the substance called dynamite, requires exact and at the same time comprehensive legal definition. Its atrocity will justify any punishment, within the limits of those kinds of punishment that will tend to prevent its repetition, and at the same time will be within those decent modes of repression that civilized nations can employ without incurring the reproach of barbarism. But then, in order to lay the foundation for treaties of extradition, every offense must be carefully defined as a crime before extradition can be asked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for; because the country that is to make the surrender must act with some reference to its own laws, usages, and habits, in dealing with persons that have come within its dominions from abroad. There is, or ought to be, no such thing as an arbitrary and unregulated surrender by one government to another of a supposed criminal that has fled from the justice of one country into the territory of another. The first thing for every country to do is to define the crimes for which it will ask other countries to make extradition of fugitives. The next thing is so to shape the treaties of extradition that the kind and degree of evidence that is to make a *prima facie* case of guilt shall be carefully and accurately laid down. Not only must the *corpus delicti* be well defined by the country where the crime has been committed, but the treaty must establish some rule of evidence which the magistrates of the country making the arrest and asked to make the extradition can apply for the identification of the person charged with the crime. But as the extradition is to be made only for the purpose of having the guilt or innocence of the accused person determined by the proper tribunals of the country in which the crime was committed,—that is, for a purpose entirely analogous to the process and object of holding an accused person to answer a charge of crime under the municipal law,—every treaty of this description should bind the Government receiving the accused to put him on trial for the specific offense for which his extradition is asked, and for no other offense whatever. Guarded in this way, extradition treaties can be easily made consistent with all the claims of individual liberty that must be respected and cared for.

It is now more than forty years since the first treaty for the extradition of fugitives from justice was made between the United States and Great Britain, by Mr. Webster as our Secretary of State and Lord Ashburton as Special British Minister to this country. I happened to have some personal knowledge of the course of Mr. Webster's reflections when he first took up this important subject. He had at one time some doubt how far he ought to recognize it as an established principle of international law, that nations do not surrender to each other fugitives from justice without positive convention. But he soon satisfied himself that this is the modern rule; and then the only question was, how the convention was to be framed, and what should be the crimes for which the two nations should mutually agree to make extradition. The similarity be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween the English and American criminal jurisprudence made it comparatively easy to agree on a few crimes that were defined alike by the law of both countries. The fact that the first treaty has led to difficult questions, should not cause us to overlook the importance of what was done by the establishment of the first precedent. The most important matter that now demands the attention of statesmen and publicists is, how to extend the principle to new crimes, and to adapt new treaties to the requirements of justice and the peace and safety of society.

In regard to the other offense, namely, that committed by persons remaining here but aiding and abetting the actual perpetrators of the crime in another country, extradition is of course not the remedy. When a man in this country supplies another in a foreign country with the means of committing an act of violence in that other country, or aids him in his plans, the man that so operates from our territory does not commit a crime that either country can punish, unless the law of both countries is so framed that the offense is previously defined and punished by the law of the country where the offense of so aiding and abetting is committed, although he has committed an offense that is, morally speaking, of a most heinous description. What is to be done, therefore, is for the proper legislative authority to define and punish this particular subordinate and auxiliary offense. That authority, in this country, is Congress, which has ample power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Dynamite and every other explosive substance that is carried across the ocean, from any port in the United States to any port in Europe, enters into commerce just as every other commodity does. Although Congress cannot tax exports of any kind, it has plenary power to regulate the mode in which any commodity shall be carried to a foreign country. Congress can require a manifest of the contents of any package whatever; can authorize proper officers to ascertain the name of the shipper; can require the shipper to give security that will satisfactorily show an honest and innocent intended use of the article shipped; can require the name of the consignee to be given, and can take many other precautions.

All such precautions might at times be eluded; but the chances of escaping the vigilance of competent executive officers, especially if seizures under suspicious circumstances should be duly authorized, would be exceedingly small. The exposure of the vessel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its cargo, and of the lives of all on board, when dynamite or any similar explosive is carried, is so great that hardly any measure of repression would be too severe. It is almost impossible to imagine an honest and innocent purpose for which any commodity can be sent across the seas, which the sender or carrier should not be able and willing to show; and therefore it is impossible to imagine that innocent persons should be much annoyed by the most stringent regulations, and whatever might be the annoyance it must be submitted to for the public good.

I do not suppose it to be at all necessary to answer the absurd claim that this new and strange kind of crime belongs in the category of political offenses. There can be no sound and sensible definition of political offenses that will comprehend an attempt to blow up the English House of Commons, or the Tower of London, or the Admiralty office, when perpetrated secretly by an individual at a time when no war exists in which that individual is an authorized actor. There are acts of war that may be carried on secretly; but if those who do them happen to be caught, and cannot show that they are authorized agents of a belligerent power, municipal and international law will alike treat them as they would any pirate or brigand. As to what are commonly called political offenses, they comprehend only such as treason, and efforts to make an insurrection or a revolution, or to overthrow an established government by violence; and even some of these acts, which are properly included in the category of political offenses, might with entire propriety, and with no danger to the proper liberty of political action, be made ordinary crimes under the municipal law of constitutional and well governed countries.

GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS.

A CRIME is an offense against the sovereign within whose dominions it is committed, and the question of punishment belongs exclusively to that sovereign. Other nations are supposed to be indifferent in the matter, and if the offender flies to one of them for refuge, he is suffered to remain unmolested. This is the general rule. Among enlightened nations, however, the fact has come to be recognized that all offenses that are evil in themselves and do not derive their criminal quality from local policy and statutes, are so far injurious to the world at large that all are concerned in their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

punishment. Murders committed in France or Germany do not merely shock the public mind and create a feeling of uneasiness and insecurity in those countries, but they affect, though in a less degree, the public of Great Britain and America, and do something toward rendering life less secure the world over. The interest that murder committed in France or Germany shall be punished, is therefore general; not merely on grounds of theoretical justice, but because immunity to crime in any part of the civilized world has a disquieting and demoralizing effect, which cannot be limited by national boundaries. Moved by this consideration, and by the obvious dangers that must threaten any country that invites to itself the criminals from other countries by offering them safe asylum, nations enter into treaties whereby they agree that offenders against the sovereignty of one, escaping to another, shall be returned for trial and punishment. From these treaties, however, two classes of offenses are commonly excluded: first, mere misdemeanors, which from their insignificance it would be beneath the dignity of nations to make the subject of such formal negotiation; and second, political offenses.

A political offense, like any other crime, is an offense against sovereignty; but it is peculiar in this, that it is either an act done in furtherance of an attempt to overthrow an existing government, or an act done in defense of a government that proves unable to maintain itself against revolution. The defeated revolutionist and the unsuccessful defender of a government overthrown, are, in the contemplation of municipal law, alike guilty of treason, and may be visited with its penalties. In these cases the event of the attempted revolution determines the criminality, and not any vicious quality that may be involved in the act done; and it will sometimes happen that other nations will sympathize with the political offender instead of desiring his punishment. But, whatever may be their sentiments, they cannot aid in punishing him without to some extent becoming parties to the controversy out of which his offense has sprung, and the fact is now generally recognized that criminality in the case of political offenses must be treated as essentially and exclusively local.

Difficulty may in any particular case arise in determining whether an act charged as an offense was or was not political. Treason is a political offense; and if an act is charged as treason, the charge itself settles the non-extraditable character of the act.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in most cases in which treason may be charged, the act constituting it might also be complained of as some other offense, and perhaps might be indicted under some other name for the very purpose of obtaining the extradition of the offender, when, if he were indicted for the actual offense, extradition would be promptly refused. Thus, an unsuccessful leader of a rebellion might be indicted for the murder of the persons killed during the struggle. If this were done, nothing on the face of the indictment would indicate that the act charged as murder was anything but an act of private malice. But if extradition were demanded, it would not only be the right but the duty of the government upon which the demand was made to inquire into the facts, and to refuse compliance if satisfied that the accusation had been made to assume the particular form in order to evade a very proper exception to the rules agreed upon for extradition.

But while one government might thus indirectly and by a species of fraud undertake to make another a party to the punishment of a political offense, a person actually guilty of murder might fraudulently set up the pretense that his act was political, in order to escape just punishment. If, for example, a man, out of private malice and for revenge, were to strike down the Secretary of State, or blow up the building appropriated to that department of the government, and were afterward to fly to some foreign country, it would be easy for him to advance the excuse that his act was committed in the expectation, or at least the hope, that it might be the beginning of a revolution, and on that ground claim the benefit of the exception that shields political exiles. Any such case might present questions of fact to be passed upon by the executive upon whom the demand was made, or by such judicial tribunal as might be empowered to consider it. Neither the form of the charge on the one hand, nor the excuse set up on the other, can be accepted as conclusive; but the facts must be inquired into, and extradition refused or ordered according as it is found that the act was or was not, in its nature and purpose, in a true sense political.

All this is believed to be unquestionable; and what remains to be considered is, how it applies to the case of dynamite crimes. A prior question perhaps is, What is a dynamite crime? Upon this space will not permit us to enlarge, and we may content ourselves with passing by the matter of definition, and taking as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illustrative cases those of the destruction of the Russian Emperor and the attempt upon the Tower of London. These acts were committed with dynamite, but their essential criminality does not depend upon that fact; they would have been equally criminal, and belonged in the same category, had some other agency of destruction been chosen. Had the person that killed the Czar been discovered in this country, and been demanded for extradition as a murderer under proper treaty provisions (had there been such), he could have claimed no exemption because of the killing having been accomplished in the particular method that was chosen. Methods and agencies are immaterial; and the homicide would be required to show, in resisting extradition, that he had a proper political end in view in what he did. As no attempted revolution was then in progress, and the deed was an isolated act of destruction, the most that could be said for it would be, that it was hoped by means of it to inspire such terror among the governing class as would force concessions in the direction of popular liberty. If that excuse were advanced in this country, on behalf of one who had slain the ruler of another, it would be necessary for the executive, in dealing with it, to face the fact that whatever doctrine was applied in the case of Emperor or King, must be applied in the case of President as well. If we refuse to extradite the slayer of one of these, on the ground that his act was political, other countries must on the same ground refuse to return any assassin that may escape to them after killing a President. This is self-evident; no one country can concede to another a protection for rulers that is not reciprocated.

No doubt it would be said in such a case that dynamite crimes are only committed as a means of relief from intolerable tyranny; but any such suggestion would be without force in a country two of whose rulers have been assassinated in a single generation. But other than this there is abundant proof that dynamite may as easily be employed in the interest of tyranny as in that of liberty. Historically we find the methods of secret destruction and terrorism more often employed to rivet the chains of slavery than to break them. The assassination of William the Silent, under the instigation of Philip II., is a striking instance; and had dynamite then been discovered, the tyrant might perhaps have contrived the destruction of the whole Dutch Government, a crime to which his malice and his will were alike equal. But we need not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

go back to Philip, or beyond the confines of Britain, for evidence that dynamite methods may be employed in the interest of oppression. Lord John Russell, in his "Recollections," speaking of the period immediately before the Reform Act of 1832, when the buying up by the aristocracy of burghage or freehold tenures in small boroughs was in vogue, says, "If a freeholder or burghage tenant refused to sell, it was not a very uncommon practice to blow up his house with gunpowder, and thus disfranchise a political opponent." Even such an outrage might be defended as political, as being an act intended to prevent a change in government that would amount to practical revolution.

Every political question must be considered in the light of probable consequences. The political concerns of Ireland are at this time of engrossing interest to the whole civilized world. Ireland has been greatly wronged. In our day Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, moving on different lines, have endeavored to obtain justice for her. Mr. Parnell has assumed to represent Ireland, and has proposed very radical measures. Mr. Gladstone has represented the ruling country, and has moved as rapidly in the direction of justice as it was possible to carry a governing majority with him, and he has no doubt done much good to that unhappy country. The assassination of either of these men would seem likely to be a loss to Irish liberty. Both are public characters, with great influence upon current events, and either of them might be taken off on the reasons that inspire dynamite crimes. Suppose Mr. Parnell to be thus taken off at the instigation of some English landlord; could our Government shield the assassin as a mere political offender? Suppose Mr. Gladstone to be stricken down because his reforms had not been more radical; on what ground could a distinction in the two cases be pointed out?

One fact not to be overlooked is, that a dynamite crime necessarily strikes in the dark, and reaches innocent parties oftener than the intended victim. The persons that commit such crimes are generally without the coolness and level-headedness that enable men to predict consequences, and they are not unlikely to defeat the cause they hope to aid. Orsini undertook to advance the cause of Italian liberty by the assassination of Napoleon III.; had his bombs, instead of killing innocent by-standers, killed the Emperor, Italy, whose liberation the despot soon did so much to aid, might have been in chains to-day. And no one can say that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the assassination of the liberator of the serfs may not have nipped in the bud some further contemplated reform.

In these inventive days no one can say how far dynamite may become an agent in legitimate warfare, whether international or revolutionary. But the danger of justifying or excusing its use when there is no war in progress and no revolution attempted, is very manifest. When we become accustomed to its use as a means of correcting public evils, we may reasonably look for its employment to obtain relief from supposed social or business oppressions, and must expect to hear the same reasons advanced in justification.

THOMAS M. COOLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ENGLISH IMPERIALIST BUBBLE.

ANY person that reads English newspapers at the present time, will see much about a proposed imperial federation between England and her colonies, and if not very well versed in English affairs, he may be pardoned for imagining that there is a serious movement of great importance toward the attainment of this object by means of a sagacious and well-defined political scheme. As a plain matter of fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. During the year 1884 two conferences were held in London, at which a great deal of vague talk was indulged in as to the delightfulness of a permanent union between England and her colonies; but not a single practical proposal for the accomplishment of this object was placed before either conference. No two speakers seemed to agree as to methods; the only agreement consisted in inflated rhetoric about the splendor of the Empire. To the English Liberal or Democrat, most of those who took part in these deliberations were politicians of a doubtful kind, some of them connected with other very pernicious political movements, while nearly all were animated by what are termed Jingo sentiments.

Let it be noted that the strong political thinkers and leaders do not give any encouragement to this movement. Neither Gladstone, nor Derby, nor Chamberlain, neither Salisbury, nor Cairns, nor Northcote, so far as I know, has defended or proclaimed imperial federation as a theory. All of these statesmen may be, doubtless are, quite prepared to defend the colonies by force of arms, so long as they remain *de facto* portions of the British Empire. To this, few will object; but this is something quite different from imperial federation. Mr. Bright says he does not even know what this new theory means. Mr. John Morley calls it "pan-Britannic gimcrackery." Lord Randolph Churchill says it is "all moonshine." Mr. Courtney regards the movement as most pernicious,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as did his friend and political associate the late Mr. Fawcett. It is opposed by Mr. Frederic Harrison in the interests of a higher international morality, and by most advanced radicals as tending to perpetuate English political superstitions, and to impose them on the young and growing commonwealths beyond the seas. Of Canadian politicians, Sir Francis Hincks regards federation as impossible, and says that Canadians don't want it. Mr. Blake looks forward to severance between Canada and England as essential to the growth and dignity of the former country; and the majority of the Liberal party in Canada are with him in this respect. And the diners at the Empire Club in London, a short time ago, must have been disagreeably surprised to hear Sir John Macdonald declare that federation between Canada and England was prevented by insuperable difficulties. In South Africa the two principal leaders, Messrs. Sprigg and Upington, are not only opposed to federation, but seem generally to be decidedly unfriendly toward England. Australia seems a little more bitten with the idea; but recent events have shown conclusively a growing differentiation between the interests of England and those of her colonies in the Pacific.

The whole question is essentially a matter of details; for the question to be asked is, What are the necessary implications of a federation? The "Federalist," which is the principal summary of federal politics known to the world, alleges four reasons in justification of the American Federal Union: First, federation would remove the usual causes of war. Second, it would secure a more perfect administration of government. Third, it would defend the several States thus united against the neighboring powers. Fourth, it would prevent commercial rivalry. Not one of these reasons can be alleged in behalf of this imperialist proposal. There is practically no possibility of war between England and any of her colonies, or between any two or more of these colonies. But, on the other hand, it is possible that England's connection with two of them might involve her in war. South Africa might involve her in war with the Dutch, which, in view of current movements both in Europe and Africa, would sooner or later mean war with Germany. Canada might involve her in war with the United States. Such considerations would therefore lead rather to the dissolution of existing ties than to the formation of stronger ones. Let me dwell specially on the case of Canada, the colony that will probably determine the whole question.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every one in England has admitted, since the civil war revealed to Englishmen the true stuff of which the Northern States were made, that, with whatever other nation we go to war, we must be at peace with the United States. There is one and, so far as I know, only one cause that would produce a quarrel, and that is any attempt on the part of England to build up a great empire in North America. This would mean, sooner or later, war. The excited London editors would ask for double the number of iron-clads, guns, and torpedo-boats they have recently been demanding, and a big American army and navy would soon be added to the armaments by which the world is cursed. Some English people suppose that England has already an empire in North America, and indeed such an assertion is constantly made even by educated Englishmen. Of course nothing could be more absurd. Empire, *imperium*, signifies rule, and England does not rule in North America. Canada governs herself without the slightest regard to what the opinions of England may be. The English Government exercises no more rule in Ontario or British Columbia than in New York or Massachusetts. By federation, therefore, England would not be developing still further a power already existing; she would be attempting to create a new power, and in so doing would inevitably meet with strong resistance. The path to peace, therefore, certainly lies not that way.

Nor would imperial federation secure a better administration of government. English administration may not be perfect, but it would certainly not be improved by subjection to the criticism and control of farmers in Manitoba, miners in British Columbia, lumbermen in Nova Scotia, tradesmen in Toronto, gold-diggers in Ballarat, sheep-masters in New South Wales, planters in Jamaica, and fighting missionaries and Calvinistic Dutchmen at the Cape. Nor, conversely, would the affairs of Canada or New Zealand gain by being remitted in any degree to English squires, Scotch farmers, Durham miners, London shopkeepers, and East Anglian agricultural laborers. And in any proper federation all these and many more would be called on to decide, for even in aristocratic England the days of limited suffrage are gone by forever.

Nor, thirdly, would imperial federation defend any state from the superior power of its neighbor. Practically, Canada is the only colony that has such a neighbor; and, as has been already maintained, imperial federation is just the one method

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of inviting the hostility of that neighbor. A defensive alliance between all English-speaking states is practicable and just, and would answer all the purposes for which a federation could be formed.

In the next place, imperial federation could not prevent commercial rivalry, because that exists already and grows every day. Canada, Victoria, Queensland, maintain formidable tariffs expressly to keep English goods out of their markets. Interests have already grown up that will demand the retention of these tariffs as in the United States. In the case of the American Union, no interests of a special kind worth naming had grown up in any single State before federation. Hence we cannot argue from one case to the other. If commercial rivalry was to be prevented (an impossibility in the nature of things, for you cannot prevent manufacturing industries from developing in great countries abundantly supplied with raw material), it should have been done half a century ago.

But if an imperial federation were established, it could only assume one of two forms. It must either resemble the original union of the thirteen American colonies prior to the adoption of the federal Constitution of 1787, or it must resemble the present American Union as it has existed subsequent to that period. The original Union was a mere alliance of independent sovereign States, none of which could be constitutionally coerced, with a central apology for a government unable to raise men or money, with no real sanction, authority, or power. It would be superfluous for English and colonial statesmen to repeat the experiment made by the American colonies last century. But if they should adopt a true federal union similar to that of the United States, what would such a step mean? One of two things: either the *de facto* English government must become the government of the whole federal empire, or a brand-new government must be formed, to which every government in the Empire, including that of England, must be subject; or, in other words, England must cease to be a sovereign state. From this dilemma there is absolutely no escape. Can colonial politicians be admitted into the English Cabinet? Obviously not, for that Cabinet is formed necessarily on English party lines, and is pledged to carry out English party objects; unknown to the written law of the country, it is a purely national growth and cannot be made imperial. But, on the other

Univ. of Tulsa Library
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hand, can a new body be created to which the English Parliament, with all the colonial legislatures, should be subject?

If any kind of federal government or parliament were created, England would of course be related to that government or parliament as any particular State is related to President and Congress at Washington. How many Englishmen can be found who, with full knowledge of the matter and without any bias of interest, would be prepared to say that the "sceptered isle," which has been a sovereign state for centuries, shall be so no longer, but shall become a single unit within a world-wide federal empire? And under this scheme the English unit would gradually but surely decline relatively to the other units. They must increase, England must decrease; this is the decree of nature. To these colonies belongs the future; they must expand in resources and increase indefinitely in population. But England herself has no such future. She may be, probably will be, the great center of culture and of intellectual production for the English-speaking peoples. It may be given to her to spiritualize the English-speaking democracy of the world. To her the inhabitants of distant regions may repair to visit their ancestral seats and to drink from the ancient fountains of historical inspiration. But in the future power will depend absolutely on population plus material resources; and as the colonies will in time easily surpass England in these matters, it follows that in a federation she would sooner or later be relegated to a very subordinate position. As a sovereign state, even though small, England would control her own destiny; as a unit in a federal empire, she would be compelled to acquiesce in whatever millions of other people in every part of the world thought was good for her. The advocates of imperial federation do not, it is true, mean this. They intend, in some inexplicable way, that this federal empire shall redound to the glory of Great Britain, and give her a prestige she cannot otherwise acquire. They are for the most part people who hold that any country is specially honored by being connected with England, and cannot possibly imagine that a people may have great respect and regard for England, and yet may not in the least desire to share her political life. In short, they desire to extend and intensify the political power of England at any cost—at the cost of bloodshed in Egypt and the Soudan, Zululand and the Transvaal; at the cost of a gigantic and ever-increasing expenditure in England; at the cost of domestic democratic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reform, which many advocates of imperial federation wish to prevent by distracting the attention of the country with the problems arising out of a spirited foreign policy; and lastly at the expense of the whole future of the colonies themselves.

For it is this last consideration that is the real pith of the whole matter. Imperialists do not understand that this question will be settled by the colonies themselves, and not at all by England. The imperialists never concern themselves with the legitimate interests of the colonies, but always with the prestige and fancied interests of Great Britain. It is such an honor, they think, to be connected with England, that they assume that the interests of the colonies must lie in such a union. This may be natural from an English point of view, but it is a palpable *petitio principii*. English prestige and interests have nothing to do with what is purely a colonial question. And the chief objection to these federation schemes is, that they attempt to set aside decrees of nature and facts of politics in favor of some artificial contrivance of their own. England's colonies are separated from her by thousands of miles of sea, and they consequently belong to different political systems. England herself has always belonged, and will continue to belong, to the European system. She cannot help herself in this matter, but must remain within the limits of the European diplomatic circle, of which for centuries she has been an integral part. To this she is pledged by a hundred guarantees, a thousand treaties. She is interested in the Eastern question, in the neutrality of Belgium, in the independence of Holland. With none of these matters have the people of the United States anything to do. Why should the people of Canada have anything to do with them either? Their interest is on the American continent, that of English statesmen is on the European and the other continents of the old world. England has European possessions; she owns Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, Heligoland. She is bound by the Anglo-Turkish convention to defend the Asiatic dominions of the Porte against attack; and there are not wanting people in England who would go to war to prevent Constantinople from falling into the hands of Russia. By her occupation of Egypt, England is more deeply involved than ever in the European system. Her troops must stay there, and probably in the Soudan also; and yet she cannot exercise supreme sway, owing to the European control that she is compelled to acknowledge, spite of the bluster of London journalists. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Asia England is absolutely responsible for the government of two hundred millions of people, while her rulers and agents are called upon to watch with unceasing vigilance the resistless stride of the eastern Slavonic power. In short, England has built up an ever-increasing empire, which needs an ever-increasing supply of men and money, and which everywhere comes in contact with the real or fancied interests of other European powers, resulting in endless wars and deeper and deeper complications. So much is this now the case that the English Cabinet is no longer master of the situation. The Liberal Cabinet comes into office with professions of peace and retrenchment; and its career is one long record of war, conquest, annexation, and huge expenditure. And this not because Mr. Gladstone did not honestly mean to carry out a policy of peace and retrenchment, but because imperial necessities overruled personal inclinations.

Into this lazar-house of old-world political diseases the advocates of imperial federation propose to introduce the healthy, vigorous peoples of the new continents, taking them from their proper sphere and connecting them with an old-world power in whose ever-increasing complications they would be inextricably involved. It must be deliberately said that he who knowingly and of set purpose does this, is an enemy of these young countries. And if we take the most important of them, Canada, we cannot fail to see that its interests are sacrificed even now to the imperial connection, and that they would be sacrificed to a far greater extent under imperial federation. While the debt of the United States has been reduced by enormous sums, the debt of Canada is increasing by leaps and bounds, until now a people numbering only five millions, who ought to have no debt at all and scarcely any expenses of government, are crushed to the ground with financial burdens. And how incurred? Incurred mainly for imperial purposes. First, there is the *roi fainéant*, with his silly court at Ottawa to keep up. This institution is positively degrading to democratic Canada, as well as being a prolific cause of corruption. Then there are the railroads, constructed so largely for imperial and strategic purposes, some of them almost useless, but all having cost enormous sums, out of which contractors and politicians have notoriously enriched themselves. What can be thought from a rational, commercial point of view, of the Inter-colonial Railway, which was built for political purposes? And would such a line have been constructed had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Canada not been politically connected with a European country? And the Canadian Pacific Railway, constructed mainly to keep the Dominion together and to prevent British Columbia from seceding, is proving a tremendous additional burden to the people.

Then, again, there is the huge tariff. Why should there be any Canadian tariff, except for purposes of revenue? And why should hundreds of customs officials be stationed at vast expense along an imaginary line of three thousand miles to collect insignificant dues, a process connected with which there is a large amount of inevitable corruption? The answer is, that Canada must be protected against the United States. But seeing that people who speak the same language, in whose veins flows the same blood, who have the same religion, and practically the same laws, and very nearly identical systems of government, and are separated only by an imaginary line, must have substantially identical interests, why do they not reciprocate, instead of keeping up this insane system by which Canada is being slowly but surely impoverished and exhausted? The answer is, that Canada is artificially connected with England, and so is prevented from consulting her own interests, and forming a commercial, leading inevitably to a political, union with the United States. There never was a more palpable instance of all the just interests of a great country being sacrificed at the shrine of imperialism. If the people of Canada cannot be induced to see that this line of policy is certain economical disaster for them, Carlyle's estimate of the proportion of fools in England will not be wholly inapplicable in England's chief colony. But happily a considerable and increasing portion of the Canadian people have arrived at the conclusion that they cannot afford to carry on this policy for the sake of an imperialist sentiment. At a conference of the Canadian Liberal Party, under the presidency of the Liberal leader, Mr. Edward Blake, a resolution has been unanimously adopted demanding the right of the Canadian Government to conclude and ratify treaties with foreign powers, without any reference to the Government of Great Britain. This means, of course, Canadian independence, to which the Liberal Party in Canada is now committed. Both in Manitoba and British Columbia there is a growing party in favor of secession, as there is even in the specially "loyal" province of Ontario. Such a feeling is still more widely spread in the Maritime Provinces.

Such facts as these show that, spite of the loyalty to England

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which is admitted to exist in Canada, the people of that country will ultimately take whatever course may be regarded as conducive to her legitimate interests and necessary development. In a word, Canada never can become a great country so long as she is politically connected with England. That connection involves the crippling of her resources, the undue taxation of her people, the restriction of her immigration, and the reign of a stagnant provincialism which forces itself on the attention of every visitor. The connection likewise renders Canada liable to be involved in any war into which England may be plunged; a contingency that may be brought about at any time by the course of events in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Further, the federal union of England and Canada would, by building up an English power on the American continent, probably bring about at some time a collision with the United States. It may fairly be demanded, therefore, that those who place the general interests of humanity above the prestige of Great Britain should resolutely oppose imperial federation, so far at least as Canada is concerned.

No one can doubt that the independence and secession of Canada, whenever accomplished, will produce a profound effect upon the whole imperial connection. It will destroy the prestige of the Empire and will act as a solvent upon the imperialist sentiment. But it would be erroneous to suppose that the connection of England with her other colonial groups stands on the same footing as her connection with Canada. In the case of Canada, the proximity of the United States is the great determining factor. Even were there no American Republic, the difficulties of a federal union between Canada and England would be immense, for the reasons already alleged; but the presence of the United States—Canada's natural and inevitable ally—renders the difficulties insuperable.

The case of each of the other colonial groups must be considered on its own merits. The Cape has been a source of trouble and of enormous cost to England ever since she had it; and the situation there to-day is worse, from the English point of view, than it has ever previously been. I do not know who would weep for its secession, except Mr. Forster and the editor of the "Pall Mall Gazette." The past seven or eight years of South African history form one of the most disgraceful chapters in modern records. The colonists have been unscrupulous, the British agents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have countenanced plunder under the specious names of protectorate and annexation, the natives have been swindled and murdered, religious cant and commercial greed have formed an unholy alliance, and the English Government has proved itself blundering, ignorant, and incompetent. Its blunders, however, are due, not to the ill intentions of its members, but to the system. England tries to do what, in the nature of things, she cannot do. A committee of gentlemen sitting round a table in Downing Street cannot possibly understand the condition of affairs thousands of miles away in South Africa. Accordingly, they rely on their agents for information. These agents are all of the class that believes in annexation and a spirited policy. They advise the Cabinet in accordance with their own predilections. The Cabinet acts on the advice, to find, when it is too late, that the facts of the case are erroneously reported to it. This was exactly what Sir Bartle Frere did in South Africa when he led the English Government to believe that a South African confederation was generally desired by the people, and that the Boers of the Transvaal were consumed with a burning desire to be incorporated into the British Empire. What disasters have accrued from that fatal policy all the world knows. A similar process, it may be pointed out in passing, has been going on in Egypt. The necessity for the ultimate cessation of the connection with the Cape is rendered the more obvious because Englishmen there are in a minority, and the present Premier is absolutely hostile to the home Government. Union is quite impossible, for a very strong assertion of imperial authority on the part of England would almost certainly lead to a great civil war throughout South Africa, which would not only dangerously tax the not too immense military resources of England, but would lead to further far-reaching consequences by reason of the probable reversion of Holland and of all Dutch colonies and possessions to Germany, and the very striking development of German commerce and colonization recently manifested in South and Central Africa.

The third group of colonies is the Australasian, comprising Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, and the smaller islands of the South Pacific. The position of this group is different from that either of South Africa or Canada. The Australasian colonies are more intensely English than either of the other groups. There are no fellow-colonists of foreign birth or extraction, like the Dutch in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South Africa or the French in Canada; nor is there any great neighboring nation like the United States. These colonies are to a great extent isolated from the rest of the world, and are peopled almost entirely by persons of English birth or extraction. Consequently, some of the forces that in Canada and in South Africa are making for political separation do not operate here, and it is possible therefore that the close relation of these colonies to England may be of much longer duration. But when all this has been duly allowed for, the objections to imperial federation between England and her Australasian colonies still remain. Such a federation would take these colonies out of their rightful sphere, and introduce them into the European political circle. Their blood and treasure would become liable to be spent in maintaining English rule in India, or in fighting France on the Egyptian question. If war broke out, what would be the situation of these colonies, on the unimpeachable testimony of the military and naval authorities that have lately been trying to frighten the English people about the condition of their iron-clads and coaling-stations and the supply of their torpedo-boats and big guns? It may be gathered from the testimony of these persons that a peaceful citizen of Sydney or of Melbourne might find a telegram in his morning paper telling of a rupture between England and France on the subject of Egypt, or between England and Russia on the subject of Afghanistan; might learn before retiring to bed that war had been declared; and after a sleep, broken, feverish, and haunted with dreams almost as awful as those of a London editor, might listen to the guns of a French iron-clad or a Russian cruiser while shaving in the morning at his dressing-table. Seriously, can any arrangement be permanently justifiable that places the peace, progress, and prosperity of Australia and New Zealand at the mercy of some European quarrel or intrigue with which those countries have no more legitimate concern than Greenland and Patagonia?

The sum of the whole matter lies then in this: What are the manifest interests of the colonies themselves? The question will not be settled, as most of the English imperialists appear to imagine, in England; it will be settled in the respective colonies. And the colonists will settle it in accordance with their own interests. They will consider whether their fiscal policy shall be molded in accordance with the wants and wishes of English capitalists. They will consider whether their interests will be promoted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by connection with the intrigues of European diplomacy and the rivalries of European statesmen. They will consider whether they should impose financial burdens on themselves in order to promote English foreign policy. They will consider whether either the British Parliament or some hypothetical federal council could manage any portion of their own affairs for them better than their own governments and parliaments can do. And they will do this freely and independently, quite regardless of the opinions or wishes of English "fair-traders" or military men or colonial agents.

It is the more necessary to insist upon this, since in England the question is always looked at from the English point of view. The imperialists in England always, avowedly or tacitly, advocate federation because it would be good for England, not at all because it would necessarily be good for the colonies. No doubt they assume it to be good for the colonies, or have persuaded themselves that it is so; but this is a matter with them of quite minor importance. To the average Englishman, England is as much the "hub" of the solar system as Boston to any Bostonian; and, to quote Dr. Holmes, "you couldn't pry that out of" an Englishman, "if you had the tire of all creation straightened out for a crowbar." Thus the "fair-traders," as they call themselves, look upon the colonies as convenient instruments for maintaining the supremacy of British trade. And the average Jingo wishes the colonies to contribute toward an imperial navy that shall be equal to the combined navies of Europe, and shall thus maintain English prestige in the eyes of European sovereigns and statesmen. All this is to be done for the glory and profit of England.

The real motive power, therefore, of this agitation for imperial federation becomes perfectly obvious. It is by no means a great humanitarian movement for securing peace on earth and good will among men. It is, stripped of all the pretentious verbiage and vague rhetoric with which it has been adorned, an attempt on the part of certain interests to maintain their hold over mankind. The military and aristocratic class has joined hands in this matter with a large section of the capitalist class, in order to secure the promotion of English financial interests, and to strengthen, if possible, English imperialism. Well-meaning men with other objects in view may have helped in the movement, and may do so in the future; for it cannot be denied that the idea of a close bond connecting English people acts as a powerful sentiment, which may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be felt to be convincing when unconnected with reason and with a complete knowledge of the facts of the case. But the accidental presence of well-meaning men should not blind any one to the real character of a movement that constitutes the greatest, because most insidious, danger that the cause of democracy in England has to face. It is a movement that in its essence is intended to divert the broad stream of human progress into the narrow channel of English capitalism. Readers of Professor Seeley's "Expansion of England" are misled by the glittering ideal they see in that book. The real thing is the union of such people as Lords Bradbourne, Rosebery, and Dunraven, who know perfectly well what they want, in the interest of a cause fatal to the development of English democracy, and still more fatal to all the just interests of those young commonwealths beyond the seas.

WILLIAM CLARKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SUBTERRANEAN HISTORY OF MAN.

THE methods and results of historic investigation have undergone striking changes during the present century; and one of the most important factors in the change has been the direct resort to memorials left behind them by the unknown ages—monuments above ground and relics beneath. Sometimes these monuments themselves have been preserved by burial, natural or artificial, and have also become part of the subterranean history of mankind. So great a mass of solid historic fact has been revealed by the spade, that one is almost ready to say there is more of veritable ancient history coming and to come from beneath the ground than from above it. The results of these excavations, often curious and surprising in themselves, are important chiefly from the comparisons they enable us to make, and the connections they are slowly permitting us to establish, among the races and events of the distant past. And though each new discovery too readily becomes the occasion of some unsubstantial theory, further investigation soon extinguishes the vagary. While we cannot avoid all disputed points, we can refer to a great mass of material thus accumulated, resting on high authority.

What could seem at first more impenetrable than the darkness that hung over this country prior to its discovery, or rediscovery, four centuries ago? Yet within a generation we have gained by exhumation a basis of facts whereby we can not only reproduce much of the life and habits of the earlier ages, but, by combining these with indications from other sources, can already reason with some probability upon the relations of the various occupants of the soil, and their migrations. Without the aid of a scrap of writing, we can say that hundreds of years, perhaps a thousand, before Columbus, probably while the mastodon was here, the area of the United States was occupied by a race much superior to the modern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indian tribes. They were plodding and industrious, capable of great enterprises and persistent toil, constructing millions of cubic feet of embankments, thousands of mounds—ten thousand in Ohio alone—and miles of defensive works, commonly of earth, sometimes of earth and stone, and in one instance more than two miles of stone. They were cultivators of the soil, dwelling in large communities and for long periods in the fertile valleys of the interior and Western States, shrewdly pre-occupying the sites of the chief towns and cities—Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Marietta, Dayton, Portsmouth, Chillicothe, etc. Their center of progress, if not of power, was apparently in south-western Illinois, where within a radius of fifty miles there were five thousand mounds, one of them, at Cahokia, ninety feet high and covering half as much ground as the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh. They manufactured pottery in a great variety of forms, using some of it for cooking; made salt from the saline springs of Illinois and Missouri; procured shells and pearl from the Gulf of Mexico, and obsidian from beyond the Rocky Mountains; brought mica in great sheets from mines in North Carolina, and red pipestone (catlinite) from the head-waters of the Missouri; quarried flint (chert) on Flint Ridge, Ohio; wrought the copper mines of Lake Superior over an extent of a hundred and fifty miles, hammering the metal into implements, ornaments, and weapons, and learning finally—in Wisconsin, at least—to smelt it. According to Dr. Newberry, they wrought the oil-wells of Canada and Pennsylvania, and, according to the State Geologist of Missouri, they dug canals in that State, fifty feet wide by twelve feet deep. Their vast public works would indicate a despotic government, and perhaps a strong priestly influence. The definite sizes, shapes, and correspondences of their circles, squares, and other inclosures and embankments, are thought to imply standards and implements of measurement. They sometimes practiced cremation, if not human sacrifice. They were a race of smokers, and lovingly carved their pipes into admirable representations of birds and beasts; and their artistic turn showed itself further in small sculptures, often from the hardest stone, of more than forty kinds of animals and birds. They wove and wore cloth, sometimes in the shape of a blouse drawn in at the waist and reaching to the knees. If they did not play "chunky," they prepared the large sunken areas in which the Creeks afterward played the stupid game; and it requires but a slight stretch of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imagination to believe that their great earth-circles, graded ways, and high mounds witnessed the grandest processions and ceremonials. They adorned themselves with copper bracelets and necklaces of shell beads, claws, and teeth, and made whistles of buckshorn, and awls and needles of bone, horn, and copper. The diversity and extent of their agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and public works would involve a considerable division of labor. If we borrow a few circumstances from the Hochelagans (a sporadic tribe of Canada that had caught and preserved some of their traits till the visit of Cartier in 1535), we may understand that they raised maize, beans, and pumpkins, and added to these articles of food fresh fish from the streams, and probably smoke-dried fish from the lakes, wild fruits, and the various kinds of game immortalized in their carvings and pottery. Their clustered dwellings sometimes stood on straight, intersecting streets; their cultivated fields covered a hundred acres, and even three hundred; their situation on the streams suggests boats or canoes. They carefully buried their dead with ornaments and implements—seldom weapons—in cists under low tumuli, much like the British tumuli, and their distinguished dead in great mounds, sometimes seventy feet high and covering an acre and a half. They did not pass away by disease, but by hostile invasions, although syphilis had made its appearance. Cartloads of stone hammers and masses of detached copper left in the mines, would indicate a sudden abandonment. Cut off from the mines and the lakes, and subjected to incursions upon their cultivated fields, they evidently struggled hard, but receded to the south, to be merged with the Nahua or Toltec race of Anahuac, with whom their skulls and sculptured faces seem to ally them.

For the anterior history of this and the other American races we are obliged to appeal to a wider range of facts. Forty years ago Prescott expressed the opinion that "the civilization of Anahuac was in some degree influenced by that of Eastern Asia," and Humboldt still earlier had pronounced "an ancient communication" to be "most evident," on account of "striking analogies with the ideas of Eastern Asia," not explicable as simply the result of the uniform condition of all nations in the dawn of civilization. These opinions, founded on a different set of premises, find a strong confirmation in the excavations of the two continents. A still wider range is thus suggested. Nilsson (in 1868), though re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferring the facts to "an instinctive contrivance created by a sort of natural necessity," was yet constrained to comment on "the remarkable fact of the great resemblance in the stone implements of different tribes in different periods and the most distant countries." He even asserts "a similarity, or rather identity, not only of the simpler implements of stone and bone that occur among very distant nations in the Old and New World, but also between implements more or less complicated." He cites various instances, and "above all, the small heart-shaped arrow-heads of flint from Scania, and of obsidian from Terra del Fuego, both of which are, with regard to shape and mode of construction, even in the most minute details, and when viewed with the microscope, surprisingly similar, as if they had been made by the same hand on the same day." Dr. Dawson, in his "Fossil Man," notes such correspondences as these: the ancient tomb of Knock-Maraidhe near Dublin, "the precise counterpart of the oldest American interments;" the almost exact similarity of the gouges and other stone implements of the two continents; bone harpoons similarly notched on one side, from Denmark, Kent's Cavern (England), Nova Scotia, and modern Terra del Fuego; similar bone needles from Canada, Belgium, and France; grooved hammers of the same construction from many parts of the world; skull drinking-cups of the Hochelagans as of the old Norsemen; the Hochelagan pottery precisely like that from an English barrow, made of clay mixed with sand and kneaded out to give it a laminated structure; the edge-marking with finger-print and nail, alike in Canadian, British, and Swiss specimens. Dr. Foster, in his "Prehistoric Man," finds a strikingly similar chevron border on three pieces of ancient pottery, from San José near Mexico, from the Shell Banks of Louisiana, and from Lake Neuchatel in Switzerland; and axes from Wisconsin, "almost exact counterparts of those found in Ireland and in the Swiss lakes." Humboldt carried home from an ancient mine in Peru a bronze chisel containing the same proportions of copper and tin (94 to 6) with one found by Wilkinson at Thebes. The Egyptian bronze, however, had usually more tin. Even the "Westminster Review" (October, 1884, pp. 536–7) remarks that "the resemblance of the human forms in the sculptures of Palenque to some Egyptian gods and priests cannot escape the intelligent reader;" and while peremptorily denying all connection of Mexico and Peru with Europe and Asia, yet speaks of the "coincidences"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and "parallelisms" between the Mexican religion and Japanese Shintoism, as "odd," "striking," and "startling." M. Mortillet has recently found the flint axes from the valley of the Delaware so like those from the valleys of the Somme and Garonne as to make it seem "probable that there was formerly a great bridge between America and Europe." Add to this the necklaces of shell-disks and of animals' teeth, alike in France and Ohio, and the recent discovery in France, Michigan, and the Canary Islands of human skulls trepanned both before and after death. These curious coincidences continually come to light. Thus Dr. Stephen Brown writes from California that he has found specimens "identical with all the stone implements figured by Dr. Schliemann in his 'Mycenæ.'" The animal figures of the Mound-builders' pottery, including the head of a pig, are matched in part by terra cotta vases found by Schliemann at Hissarlik in the form of the cat, the mole, the hedgehog, and the hog's head; though animal forms rarely occur in the pottery of Western Europe. And of the owl's-head handle of a Missouri drinking-cup, the Marquis de Nadaillac says, perhaps strongly, in his "Prehistoric America," that it is "so like those found at Santorin or at Troy that they might be mistaken the one for the other." This list could be greatly extended. Nadaillac's volume alone would add more than twenty resemblances equally striking.

Such coincidences, many of which can not well be regarded as accidental or spontaneous, when combined with other facts and with the common traditions of the two continents—as of the deluge, more or less in detail—are strikingly significant. Indeed, there is one living race on this continent, the Eskimos, between whom and the flint-men of West Göthland and the cave-men of France, European excavations have established the closest connection. Nilsson found the old Scandinavian sepulcher in all its several great peculiarities "identical with the modern Eskimo hut," so that it seemed "scarcely possible to assume that all these various and important minute similarities should be only accidental." While he did not quite accept the necessary solution, Lubbock in 1869 saw "some reason to believe that the Eskimos once inhabited Western Europe." Mr. Boyd Dawkins, in his "Early Man" (1880), is perfectly pronounced. After reviewing all the facts, he declares the probable identity of the Cave-men of Europe and the Eskimos of America to be the only admissible hypothesis. This theory

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is understood to be now somewhat generally accepted. In view of these and many correlated facts, especially the showing by many writers, from Lyell to Quatrefages, that transition by Behring's Strait is easy and not uncommon, by the Pacific quite feasible and probable, and by the Atlantic and its islands practicable, we easily frame a provisional American history thus: Successive waves of migration across Behring's Strait, dividing by the Rocky Mountains into separate lines of southward movement, variously modified by accessions from south-eastern Asia; these races and movements struck by hunting tribes from Europe by the Atlantic, driving the Eskimos and their congeners north, and the Mound-builders and their kindred southward to crowd and conquer each other there, and filling their territory with a variously modified race of savages. Future explorations, it may be believed, will reach much more definite results, and fill the outline.* We might indeed add to it now.

In Europe the researches of forty years upon fossil man have given us a moderately complete outline of centuries of unwritten history, without entering much on debatable ground or raising distinctly the question whether these types of men represent an advance or a degradation from a primitive condition and central origin. One main fact is settled, that the oldest, lowest form of manhood that the earth presents is a real manhood, with tools, ornaments, social life, and mastery of the brute world, able to capture and conquer the fleetest and fiercest of beasts. In the words of M. Joly, in his "Man before Metals," "the man who has left incontestable proof of his existence in the most ancient quaternary beds . . . . was man in all senses of the word, anatomically, intellectually, morally." We can picture his life and habits, the life of the man that certainly was contemporary with the mammoth and the cave-bear, the oldest of the so-called extinct animals. Without encumbering ourselves with minor subdivisions of the so-called palæolithic age—a matter still under discussion among the ablest palæontologists—we find a man (certainly at Cro-magnon and Mentone) of powerful frame and large brain. He dressed in skins, which he had sewed with sinews and a bone needle, and which he laid aside for the summer hunt, and he protected his hands sometimes with a long, four-fingered glove.

* The somewhat prevalent theory that the Indians were descendants of the Mound-builders encounters very grave difficulties.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With his barbed harpoon he captured salmon, trout, pike, carp, and even the seal. With his light arrows he brought down the crane, duck, snowy owl, ptarmigan, and other birds, great and small. With his sharp spears, daggers, and arrows he not only struck down the musk-sheep, wild horse, ox, ibex, bison, urus, and great numbers of reindeer, but mastered the bear, lion, and perhaps the mammoth—one of which he has sketched in the act of charging, with eyes set, trunk up, and mouth wide open. He sent his arrows with such force as to imbed them in the skull of the stag, and hurled his javelin quite through the lumbar vertebra of the urus as it rushed upon him. Possibly—Steenstrup and Dupont say, probably—his dog then accompanied him. That he tamed the reindeer, Quatrefages considers "an open question;" that he had domesticated the horse, is, judging from the remains at St. Acheul, Abbeville, and Amiens, and the forty thousand specimens at Solutré, not unlikely. His winter house, but probably not his summer residence, was a cavern. He cooked his food by the fire, and made use of pottery.* Flint arrows lodged in human bones, a spear-head thrust through a human tibia, a flint axe buried in a parietal bone, a hatchet-cut in the skull of a Cro-magnon woman, who was struck with her face to the foe, betray the scenes of violence that checkered prehistoric life. The prehistoric man decorated himself at times with red paint, and ornaments of shells, bones, and teeth, and made himself whistles of the small bones of the deer. In his leisure he carved the likeness of a mastodon on its own ivory, sketched a pike, a seal, or a glove on a cave-bear's tooth, drew a picture of the cave-bear himself on a pebble, or cut on an antler a bison, a pair of horses, a reindeer grazing, two reindeer fighting, or the hunting scene where the urus is stalked or the horse is speared. He had his traffic too. Shells from the Isle of Wight found their way to Laugerie Basse, an oyster shell from the Red Sea to the Thayngen grotto, amber from the Baltic and white coral from the Mediterranean into Switzerland, the augite of Auvergne into Brittany, the green turquoise of Brittany into the south of France, and, as many think, the nephrite of Asia into Europe. He had his manufactories of flint implements at Laugerie Haute in Perigord, Chaleux in Belgium, Hoxne in Suffolk, and Pressigny in France. The presence of the

* This has been strongly denied, largely on theoretical grounds, but seems settled by the relics at Hohefels, Robschutz, and other places.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

River-Drift man is traced by Boyd Dawkins through England, France, Spain, the Mediterranean countries, Palestine, and India, to the probable center from which they swarmed, the high plateau of Central Asia.

Still more complete is the disclosure of a higher, commonly counted a later, civilization seen in the lake dwellings. These have well been called "at the same time monuments of prehistoric architecture, a zoological museum, and a gallery of anthropology." We will not dwell upon them, except to allude to the vast amount of labor expended in preparation for the dwellings, to the domesticated animals, and to the extensive range of food, including three varieties of wheat, two of barley, and two of millet; also apples, pears, cherries, and plums. These things suggest a separation from some older stock, bringing *en masse* the accumulations of the former home. Similar lake dwellings found in several other countries form a striking bond of connection extending from Scotland to Italy.

One conspicuous result of continued excavations is to correct earlier hasty generalizations. Doubts or insuperable objections are cast on several of the proposed criteria of relative or absolute antiquity. Lartet's fourfold classification of stone ages by the fauna, has been found in that form untenable. So has Mortillet's fivefold division by flint implements been reduced by himself to a threefold one, and that open to objections. Garrigou's threefold division (1, cave-bear and mammoth; 2, reindeer and aurochs; 3, polished stone, epochs), though widely accepted, is still found "somewhat arbitrary," says M. Joly. Dawkins's separation between River-Drift and Cavemen is resisted by Evans. Many definite estimates from erosions and deposits have been greatly shaken. Even the division into palæolithic and neolithic, as denoting earlier or later, has been subjected to serious questionings, on account of such conjunctions as occur at Solutré and Duruthy, and even the finding, as at Beaumes Chaudes, of the bones of palæolithic men pierced with neolithic arrows.* Wider examinations raise doubts and denials as to the supposed extreme antiquity of the circumstances and facts associated with these remains. Thus it has

* There has been much reasoning in a circle on this matter, in the steady assumption that pottery, interments, well-made flint implements, and capacious skulls annul any otherwise clear marks of the great antiquity of the deposit, and remove it from the palæolithic age.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been for some time conceded by Lubbock and others that the "extinct" cave hyena is scarcely distinguishable from the living spotted hyena of Africa. The cave bear is declared by Vogt, Brandt, Dawkins, and Gervais to be not specifically different from the brown bear of Europe; and the cave lion is pronounced by Sanford and Dawkins to be only a larger variety of the living species. Late discoveries go to show that in America the mastodon was alive much more recently than was formerly supposed, and the mammoth is thought by some to be still living in the Himalayas. The glacial age, which has been connected with man's appearance so as to carry it back hundreds of thousands of years, is maintained by late intelligent investigators to have been in America an epoch of no enormous antiquity—according to the Winchells, Prof. C. H. Hitchcock, and Dr. Andrews, from 6,000 to 12,000 years.

If we turn from the extra-historic to the early historic races, we find ourselves greatly indebted to explorations beneath the soil for the solid facts of history. When the French artillery officer, Bouchard, in August, 1799, while digging for a redoubt at Rosetta, struck a large stone of black basalt inscribed with Greek, hieroglyphic, and demotic characters, he had found the key that was to unlock the history of Egypt and has given the impulse to a remarkable movement of oriental research. It took fifteen years to make any considerable progress with the hieroglyphics. But the final result is a knowledge of the public, private, social, and religious life of Egypt, thousands of years ago, more complete and vivid than that of most intervening periods. This knowledge has come largely, though by no means solely, through subterranean investigations. The papyri have all been taken from the tombs. There also have been found the delineations of daily life in every form. The Apis mausoleum, with its store of statuettes and votive tablets, the fine temple of Edfou, the temple of Abydos with its famous tablet, were all reached by excavation. Thus too was the full structure of the Sphinx ascertained. The portrait statue of Cephrenes came from the bottom of a temple well, the tablet of Sakkára and the "Sheikh el Beled" from the grave-mounds of Sakkára, the most ancient and life-like statues of Nefert and Rah-hotep, and of Sepa and Nesa, oldest of all, from those of Meydoum, the fine jewelry of Aah-hotep from the mummy of that queen. Such is the history of a large part of the instructive Egyptian relics now found in Boulak and the museums of Europe. The spade has just

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

settled it that Tel el Maskhutah was not Rameses, but Pithom, and has dealt the last blow to Brugsch's theory of a northern exodus. Not unreasonably are great expectations turned to the excavations at San, for further light on the mystery of the Hyksos kings, and possibly some traces of Israel; and Mariette Bey has left on record the belief that further knowledge of the first six dynasties must be sought at the foot of the pyramids of Sakkára. Egyptian remains older than the Great Pyramid, still extant in the Sinaitic peninsula, show it to be no absurd supposition that the spade might yet reveal some imperishable relics of Israel around Sinai and Gadis, although nearly three thousand years of Amalekites, Nabatheans, monks, and Arabs would have left no vestige above ground. Important questions received some light from the excavations of Wilson and Warren at Jerusalem, and still more important historical and topographical information would probably come from further excavations, were they practicable. We wait impatiently for free admittance to the caves beneath the so-called Tomb of David at Jerusalem, and the Haram at Hebron. The site of Capernaum will be determined only by the spade.

It is almost superfluous to refer to the knowledge of Roman life, history, and art thus gained; for we think of Pompeii and Herculaneum, the Roman forums, the Palatine Hill, the baths of Caracalla and Titus, the Roman catacombs, the old church of San Clemente, and the like. From the baths of Caracalla alone came an immense number of works of art, including the Farnese Hercules, Bull, and Flora, while the Laocoon came from the Vigna de Fredis, and so on. Raphael resorted to the wall-paintings in the baths of Titus for suggestions in his work upon the Loggie; and to these and similar excavations at Pompeii, the Palatine Hill, the baths of Livia, and elsewhere, are we indebted for all our definite knowledge of classic painting. What we know of the Etruscans comes mostly from their tombs. The indebtedness of Christian archæology to the Roman catacombs is not yet fully written.

But it is in Babylonia and Assyria that we find the most remarkable instance of a well-nigh complete history recovered by excavation. From beneath the mounds of Kouyunjik, Khorsabad, Warka, Mugheir, and elsewhere, we have not only reconstructed in good degree the monarchies and their wars, but have ascertained their religion, art, science, employments, social, commercial, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civil life, and the lines and extent of their traffic. We recover, too, a singularly copious and varied literature.

When we follow the indefatigable labors of Schliemann at Hissarlik, Mycenæ, and Tiryns, and the still later researches on the Hittite empire, we seem to be rapidly nearing the power of connecting the threads of ancient and lost history into a continuous web. Did our space admit, we might refer to the great number of buried coins that have come to light from innumerable places, some of them to determine critical or disputed points, such as the office of proconsul in Paul's time at Cyprus. For it is noteworthy how these researches are affecting the old authorities. Herodotus, Manetho Ctesias, and most early writers suffer greatly by the contact; Berosus less, though we know him but in fragments. The only ancient historical authority that walks in safety down the centuries by the side of all these unexpected disclosures, and is constantly becoming vindicated from hostile criticism, is the sacred Scriptures. While, in all this vast range of research, very few authenticated facts even seem to conflict with those frank narratives, many a new discovery is coming to their confirmation. The old Table of the Nations (Genesis x.) acquires fresh interest and value. A land of Cush (Gen. ii. 13), long remanded to Africa alone, is found in Western Asia. The land of Shinar reappears in old Sumir, with its burnt "bricks for stone" and its "pitch for mortar." The life and times of Abraham fall into their proper setting, both in Assyria and in Egypt. The marauding monarchs of the East put in an appearance, and Arioch (Eriaku) dwells in Ellasar or Larsa. Belshazzar also, long lost and even denied to history, comes forth from a buried inscription, and Cyrus declares the capture of Babylon, "without fighting," to have been made on just such a riotous feast-day as the Scripture describes. The whole book of Daniel, notwithstanding one or two remaining difficulties, is found to be so suffused with Babylonian life, customs, and institutions, as to make it entirely impracticable, says Dr. W. H. Ward, to bring down the date, as has been attempted, three hundred years. And whereas the book of Judith is thus revealed a sheer invention, the book of Daniel, on its historic side, stands firmer than ever. In Egypt, where Herodotus is found wanting, Genesis steadily gains new confirmation. Von Bohlen, who assailed its historic accuracy fifty years ago, was extinguished in the encounter. And so great an authority as Mr. R. S. Poole has not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hesitated to assert, that the effort to reduce the date of these narratives many hundred years is wholly incompatible with their minute conformity to all the circumstances of the age of the Ramessides, and that the late Egyptian discoveries "emphatically call for a reconsideration" of that position. The excavation in the earth will undermine the castle in the air. And so great have been the results attained, and so vast is the range for further research, as almost to inspire the hope that at some future day the work of excavation, supplemented by monumental records, comparative philology, anatomy, and tradition, may lift the veil of mystery that overhangs so much of the past, and give a somewhat coherent history of the dispersions of the human race.

S. C. BARTLETT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EUROPEAN INFLUENCES IN ASIA.

For more than a thousand years Asia has been subjected to the influences of Europe. They began with the overland commerce that was largely controlled by the Italian republics, and were continued and expanded by the Portuguese, who had almost a monopoly of Oriental traffic for nearly a hundred years. Then came the Dutch and English with their powerful East India companies, which obtained the right of eminent domain and ruled the Orient with a hand of iron down to a very recent date. French and Danish East India companies were of brief existence, but the Dutch company flourished and became wealthy through its monopoly of trade, the oppression of the natives, and the exclusion of other Europeans than its own agents and people. Wars in Europe compelled its dissolution in 1795. Its successor, the *Handel Maatschapij*, or Trading Association, organized in 1824, had no such exclusive powers as the old company, though enough remains to make its business profitable. Probably no single association of men has ever exerted as much influence upon the commerce and civilization of the world as the English East India Company, which began in A.D. 1600 and practically continued without interruption down to the Indian mutiny in 1857. An association of merchants sent to the East in 1601 a fleet of five ships, the largest of 600 tons burden; in twenty years it had obtained land and established trading stations at half a dozen points in India, and also in Java, Sumatra, Siam, and several islands of the Malay archipelago. Its fleets increased, and so did the tonnage of the company's ships, and it is not surprising that in course of time it required an army to protect its interests. In 1661 it was authorized to make peace or war with any power not of the Christian religion, and it lost no time in making use of its authority. We are probably indebted to "John Company," as this powerful corporation was known in the East,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the historic preamble and resolutions, sometimes attributed to the Pilgrim Fathers: "Whereas, it has been decreed that the saints shall inherit the earth; therefore Resolved, that we are the saints." Said the Duke of Alva, on his death-bed, "I leave no enemies behind me; I've shot them all." John Company had a peaceful monopoly of commerce in the East, as it allowed no interlopers to establish competition, and silenced as far as possible all accounts of oppression of the natives in the interest of its coffers or of the private purses of its officials. Native potentates were instructed by the logic of the sword, rather than by documentary argument, and the English musket had a weighty influence in teaching the advantages of commerce with the white stranger from the land beyond the seas. Rivals from other nations were not to be tolerated; the Portuguese were reduced to the single possession of Goa, with a population of not more than half a million; the Dutch were expelled from Ceylon, where they had a valuable commerce; and *Les Indes Orientales Françaises*, which once covered a large part of the great Indian peninsula, now include Pondicherry, Mahé, and Chandernagore, with fewer than two hundred thousand inhabitants. Just before its extinction the English East India Company ruled a territory containing two hundred million people. It had a standing army of 240,000 soldiers, its commerce had extended to China and other parts of the East, and its board of directors formed a court from whose decisions there was no appeal. Its charter came up for renewal once in twenty years, and from Elizabeth to Victoria the British sovereigns had signed it with little or no hesitation. There was every prospect that the charter would again be granted in 1858; but the mutiny of '57 attracted the attention of Government and people to the misrule of India, and with one stroke of the royal pen the Company was blotted out, and its vast interests and responsibilities were transferred to the Crown.

To point a moral rather than to adorn a tale, have I sketched the history of John Company through a period covering more than two and a half centuries. To the Company we owe much for the spread of occidental ideas in India from 1600 to 1857, but we owe a great deal more to the Government that succeeded it for the progress of the work since that time. The Company was organized and managed for the sole purpose of making money, and if India derived benefit from its operations, the event was not due to any philanthropic ideas of the board of directors. Since the mu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tiny things have changed greatly for the better. India is still held and managed mainly for commercial purposes, and to afford places for surplus men of the upper class, and the British gush about "our noble mission in the East" must be taken with a good many pinches of salt, or rejected altogether; but commerce has been thrown open to everybody, and no company or individual has any longer a monopoly; many restrictions upon the natives have been removed or greatly modified, and the condition of the subject race is vastly improved. In 1857 there were but two hundred miles of railway in operation in all that enormous peninsula—one line of a hundred and twenty miles northward from Calcutta, and another of eighty miles from Bombay. Now there are eight thousand miles of railway in India, and the iron horse has an unbroken track from Cape Comorin, where he sniffs the spicy breezes of Ceylon, to Darjeeling or Peshawur, where he drinks from the melted snows of the Himalayas. He can traverse the country from Bombay to Calcutta by way of Allahabad and Benares, and before long he will have a shorter route through the Nagpore Hills. Steamers ply along the coast and upon the rivers, the telegraph line is everywhere, native newspapers are in all the towns, and the mails are transported with the certainty, security, and celerity that are made the conditions of contracts for postal transportation.

Steam is the most efficient missionary that India has ever known; not all the teachings of St. Francis Xavier and his followers, nor the eloquence of Bishop Heber, who lies entombed at Madras, can equal the work of the fleshless steed of George Stephenson. The locomotive has shaken the faith of the Hindoo more than centuries of Christian teaching, and brought confusion and perplexity to the heart of the native priest. Pilgrimages have been enjoined upon the faithful from time immemorial. A century ago a pilgrimage was a serious matter, and the devotee that journeyed on foot to the holy places of Benares, Allahabad, or Jagannath was absent from his home for months, and perhaps for years. The wealthy worshiper, traveling with all the luxury of the East, was compelled to move leisurely, and could not make his pilgrimage without a liberal expenditure of time. At present the railway shortens the road of the pilgrim to a wonderful degree; and four classes of carriages are run by the Indian companies, so that poor and rich are provided for. The priests have sought to compel their followers to make their pilgrimages on foot, as before; but,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unhappily for them, the sacred books do not specify the mode of reaching a holy place, so long as it is reached at all. Little or no attention is given to the commands of the religious teachers, and the fourth-class trains are crowded to their utmost capacity during the season of pilgrimage. The nabob on a similar mission charters an entire carriage for himself and family, and is whirled to the place of worship by an express train. The magic of the white man is more potent than the ordinances of the priests, who are seeking for new light by which to control their unruly subjects, but thus far have found none. The motion of the railway wagon is shaking the religions of India till they threaten to crumble in fragments.

Caste, too, is being destroyed by the iron horse and the road on which he runs. Under the rules of caste, the population is divided into four great bodies, with numerous subdivisions. A man of a high caste cannot touch one of a lower without being polluted; under the native laws in some parts of India, a Brahmin had the right to slay a Sudra that touched him ever so lightly by the merest accident, or even allowed his shadow to fall upon him. A man may not drink from a cup, or eat of rice cooked in a kettle, that has been used by a member of a lower caste; and if a Sudra in the disguise of a Brahmin should mingle with a dozen Brahmins, the innocent twelve would be polluted to a degree that would require long and costly penances to restore them to a condition of purity. I was once on a steamer going up the eastern coast of India, where three or four Brahmins were nearly starved to death by the accidental breaking of their cooking-pot; every other pot on board had been touched by the detested European, or the equally detested Moslem servants, and was therefore polluted, and of course the pearly rice cooked in the ship's galley was the very embodiment of wickedness. They were four days without food, and were more dead than alive when the steamer reached Calcutta. The railways do not make provision for the separation of castes, other than allowing those who can afford it to buy the exclusive right to compartments or carriages. In the third and fourth class carriages all castes are bundled in together—Sudras, Brahmins, Vaisyas, Pariahs, *et id omne genus*. A railway pilgrimage is like poverty in that it makes strange bed-fellows. The pilgrims sit on long benches running athwart the carriages, and the Brahmins congratulate themselves that by sitting carefully away from their inferiors they can avoid pollution. But the rolling of the carriages around the curves, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bustle at the stations, the hurry of entering or leaving the vehicle, together with other things incident to the journey, spoil the charm, and the pilgrims are mixed up worse than were the infant charges of little Buttercup. The polluted Brahmin decides to keep the matter to himself, to avoid the trouble and expense of restoration to purity; soon he finds he has suffered no bodily or spiritual harm, and in course of time his reason tells him that the whole caste business is an absurdity. His dread of pollution is at an end or is greatly shaken, and while he has been learning respect for those beneath him, the lower castes have been losing reverence and fear of those that rank higher.

The railway in India performs the same office as in other parts of the world, in facilitating commerce and distributing the products of the soil or the sea. The coast communicates rapidly with the interior, and the interior with the coast; the fruits of the hill regions are exchanged for those of the plains and the maritime country—the orange for the mango, and the cocoanut for the durian; and in this way the people are taught that the world is not bounded by their horizon, and the blessings of all parts of the country are more evenly distributed than ever before. European modes of work and European ways of transacting business are being steadily diffused, and it is safe to say that the effect of the western civilization in the land of the Shastas and the Vedas has been greater during twenty-five years since the extinction of John Company than in any entire century preceding it.

Let us turn now to Java and the Malay archipelago. With the exception of four years, from 1811 to 1816, Java has been a Dutch possession in one form or another for about the same time that the English have been established in India. Down to 1830 the country made comparatively little progress in the adoption of European civilization, but since then there has been a wonderful advance in that direction. To the genius of General Van Den Bosch, regarded in his day as a visionary dreamer whose schemes were utterly impracticable, Java is indebted for the culture system that has dotted the island with prosperous villages tenanted by an industrious people, covered the whole region with well-tilled farms, and established a system of roads that render every locality accessible. Railways extend inland from the three principal ports, and before long they will be stretched from one end of the island to the other. Thirty thousand Europeans hold twenty millions of natives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in subjection; the administration of the government is costly, and money is expended freely for public works; but after paying all expenses the Dutch East Indies deliver annually five million dollars into the home treasury. Java is one of the most densely peopled countries in the world, averaging 337 persons to the square mile. The population has trebled since 1826, and the recent earthquake may have been a providential dispensation to reduce the rapid growth of the census-tables. Travel through the length and breadth of Java, and you will rarely see a beggar; good order prevails everywhere, and there are no idlers, for the simple reason that the Government compels every man to be industrious, and guarantees him the reward of his labor. Doubtless the native princes may wish to return to the old system, but there are few of the lower classes who would favor it. The same conditions prevail in a general way through the whole of the Malay archipelago; the Dutch rule is by no means mild, but it is less rigorous than was that of the Dutch East India Company, and is far preferable to the constant warfare with which the native princes managed to kill time and their neighbors.

The most important part of Burmah is under British rule. Steamers navigate the Irrawaddy to its head-waters, while the railway extends to the frontier of the native kingdom, and will soon be at the gates of Mandalay, the capital. Siam preserves its independence unimpaired, but its capital city shows many evidences of the influence of the Occident. Its enlightened young king has adopted many of the customs of the West, and is an earnest student of our civilization. His army is officered by foreigners, is equipped with foreign weapons, and is drilled after the manner of Europe; he has established a postal system through the aid of the American Minister, and his kingdom has been admitted to the Postal Union; the telegraph connects Bangkok with the other capitals of the globe, and the Siamese flag floats above a fleet of steamers plying on the Menam and forming a regular line to Singapore. The Malay peninsula is largely under British control, and the port of Singapore is one of the most important commercial centers of the Orient. Farther to the east are Cochin-China and Cambodia, under French domination; and quite recently the tricolor has been extending its influence into the territory claimed by China, the greatest, oldest, and most populous empire of the world. The French are spreading the ideas of the West with the aid of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the chassepot and the mitrailleuse, in the same way that the English have carried the blessings of commerce to the people of India with the musket and sabre.

In the interest of commerce, England made war upon China and compelled her to buy the opium that was the chief export of India; and the entering wedge made by the opium war has been slowly but surely driven till the wall of seclusion is everywhere broken down. Foreigners may now travel unrestricted from end to end of China, though they run occasional risks from a lawless mob, and the foreign merchant enjoys commercial privileges that are denied to the native. The Chinese were quick to perceive the advantages of Western civilization in some of its features, and have adopted them, somewhat to the discomfiture of the intruders. There are banks, shipping houses, and insurance companies on the western system, wholly capitalized and managed by Chinese, and there are Chinese steamboat and steamship companies plying on the great rivers and along the coast. In the open ports the Chinese are steadily encroaching upon the business formerly monopolized by foreigners; in Hong Kong, Singapore, and Saigon, Chinese merchants are supplanting the stranger and driving him into bankruptcy. A navy and an army have been created upon the European model; Chinese dockyards are building ships of war like those of the great maritime powers; and Chinese arsenals at Tientsin, Shanghai, Foochow, and Canton are making Remington rifles, 2,700 daily, and a proportionate number of Gatling and Nordenfeldt guns. Two hundred thousand Chinese soldiers are armed and drilled in the European fashion, and the number can be increased as fast as it can be provided with weapons. Less than twenty-five years ago an American adventurer named Ward organized an army of a thousand men for the capture of Soo-Chow; it soon grew to three thousand, and under his successors—Burgevine first, and then Gordon—its strength and fame increased. So triumphant was its course that it became known as the "Ever-Victorious;" and from that germ has come the Chinese army of to-day. What may another twenty-five years develop? Some there are who foresee the expulsion of the foreigner from China through the arts and arms we have given to the Orient. Nothing is so abundant in China as men, and a population of four hundred millions could muster an army of two, or four, or ten millions without a serious drain upon its resources. May there not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be, in the next quarter of a century, another Genghis Khan, or another Tamerlane, who will roll the Orient upon the Occident over the route that was followed centuries ago by the great conquerors?

Corea, the Hermit Nation, has recently opened her doors to the West and its influences, having first opened them to her neighbors, Japan and China. The whole of Siberia, from the Ural Mountains to the littoral of the Pacific and the Arctic Ocean, is under Western rule, and the events that have followed the European tours of the Shah of Persia give promise of a rapid decrease in the despotic powers of that monarch. Telegraph lines are stretched over the length and breadth of his dominions, the railway is in the near future, and the European populations of Teheran, Tabreez, Asterabad, and other cities grows numerically and influentially greater year by year. Russian soldiers are carrying their flag southward over the great plains and through the mountain chains of Central Asia, simultaneously with the northward advance of the English from India. The skirmishers of the armies of two powerful nations are confronting each other in the mountains of Afghanistan, and at any moment may come the news of battle beneath the walls of Herat.

Last but by no means least of the countries of Asia that have received the teachings and influences of the West, comes Japan. Within the memory of men hardly yet in middle life, Japan remained closed to the world, save at the little island of Deshima in the harbor of Nagasaki, where for two centuries the Dutch had maintained a trading-post. In 1854 American audacity, under the pretext of an errand of charity, forced an entrance, and the story of Japan since that time reads like a romance. The whole system of government has been changed. The Emperor, once secluded from the gaze of all but a very few of the most favored mortals, now appears in public and can be seen by his most humble subject; the *daimios* or feudal princes have been shorn of their power ; the *samurai* or military class no longer subsist upon the labor of the rest of the population, but must earn their living ; equality for all has been established by imperial decree ; and Japanese etiquette no longer requires a man to disembowel himself because another has affronted him. More than in China, and more than in India, European customs have been adopted in Japan ; the railway and the telegraph, the postal and banking systems, insurance, coinage, and many other institutions have been taken from Europe and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America, including an inflated currency of paper, impaired national credit, and impending repudiation. Let us hope, for the reputation of our part of the world, that the latter will be long deferred. Japan has even gone so far as to adopt the dress of Europe; the tasteful clothing of Nippon has been laid aside for the dress coat and its appurtenances, and the nation has lost greatly in picturesqueness. A Japanese is as much out of place in our western garb as we should be in his. The Oriental rarely appears to advantage in the garments of the Occident, and it was a most unfortunate day for Japan when the imperial decree was issued prescribing European dress for occasions of ceremony. The progress of Japan toward the civilization of the West has been, in the opinion of some of its friends, more rapid than was judicious, and there have been fears of a reaction. Such an event is not by any means impossible, but the old-time seclusion can never be restored, and Japan is destined to remain among the accessible nations of the world. With an army on the European model, with a navy of her own construction, with fleets of her own steamers plying along the coast and to foreign ports, with the railway and the telegraph, and with schools where the learning of the whole world is taught to intelligent youths and to men of middle age, Japan has undergone a change little short of miraculous since the day when Commodore Perry anchored his fleet in the shadow of Fusiyama, and trained his guns upon the osier walls of the forts of Shinagawa.

THOMAS W. KNOX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COMMENTS.

MR. EDITOR: There is a wide-spread and deep and dangerous discontent, not abroad, but at home, against what is regarded as corporation despotism. It lighted the incendiary fires of Pittsburgh, and it breathes threatenings and slaughters by the lips of applauded anarchists. The discontent is increasing. What shall be done? Neither sneering denials of the justice of this discontent, nor threatening denunciations of it, will avail us. Mr. Field suggests the association of capital and labor. But the best and most equitable co-partnership of labor and capital is the state itself, and the resumption and assumption by the state of certain great powers now exerted and perverted by corporations, would be colossal strides in the right path of progress. The state, for example, should own and operate all the railroads within its limits, and all the telegraphs, and it should monopolize the insurance business. This is not a "communistic" proposition. The governments of continental Europe own and operate the railroads and telegraphs, and the result is pre-eminently satisfactory. The work is done speedily, cheaply, and well; and the state absorbs all the profits now grasped in our country by railroad kings and electric eels. Surely, for life and fire insurance, no security would be so ample as the entire wealth of the state. The cant that was first coined in the crafty brain of the Shylocks, that "the state should never interfere with private interests," whatever element of truth it may have in Europe (where the state is not the people, but the privileged order) or in the primitive era of our own history, is both inapplicable and illogical now, especially when by "private interests" is meant the chartered privileges that involve the power of eminent domain with the added usurpation of taxation without representation. Charles I. lost his head, and George III. a continent, for attempting to levy taxes without a direct vote of the people; and yet the sum that they asked for would be a mere beggar's copper-coin-pittance compared with Gould's and the Vanderbilts' levies, wrested from the people under the names of "watered stock" and "rates as high as the freight will bear." Yet their partisans talk of the dishonesty of politicians! When did Tweed ever dare to sweep millions into his coffers by a single vote, as the railroad kings have done again and again? Our saxon blood is shown more by the way in which we submit to a king on wheels and rebelled against a king on a throne, than by any other of our national traits. No loyal Englishman every seriously complains of being robbed; he only insists on his British birthright of being robbed according to law. As

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

long as corporations shout "Thus saith the bond," we do not seem to see that we, as a state, have delegated a power that the legislature as a body cannot itself wield, namely, the power of taxation without the consent of the people.

T. R. STEPHENS.

MR. EDITOR: In the discussion of the question raised by Dr. Shedd, both he and his friends seem to have wholly overlooked the personal character, asking, not what an individual is, but what he may have done. Nothing in the universe stands still, and the human being obeys the general impulse. The moral character is undergoing constant change, progressing or retrograding, climbing higher or sinking lower. And the moral quality of the same act varies with the circumstances and motives of the actor. He that pilfers for the love of it is on a low plane morally, while a saint might take a loaf of bread to save life. The man that takes the life of another under a deep sense of injury, though bad enough, is not so degraded as he that murders for the gust of it. Human laws, indeed, call all murder by the same name, and prescribe the penalty. But this is from our inability to look into the motive. Doubtless, if man possessed the eye of infinite intelligence, penalties would be graduated somewhat according to moral culpability. Is it not reasonable to suppose that the All Father, who

> "knows each chord, its various tone,
> Each will, its various bias,"

will not trouble Himself to look into the "book of accounts," but rather will inquire into the qualities of the being that has come up to judgment? What is this thing here? Is it gold, or dross, or an amalgamation with the baser metals? This is what is constantly being done on the earth through the operation of nature's law, which is God's law; and to assert a less beneficent rule for some time in the future, however many ages hence, is to impeach Infinity. Every day, every moment of our lives, we come to judgment, and are sent to the left or are awarded the right, according not to the outward acts but the inward actions of the soul. This, being justice now, will be justice forever. The world does not so much refute as outgrow its superstitions, and it often clings to the name of an error long after it has abandoned it in fact. Less than a quarter of a century ago half the Christian world would have approved the atrocious doctrine set forth by Dr. Shedd. To-day it is a religious anachronism, and makes one feel as if contemplating an archæological object disinterred from the site of Tyre or Sidon. Nevertheless, Dr. Shedd has done positive good. His incisive statement of an antiquated creed stands in such sharp antithesis to the more enlightened modern teaching, that it serves as a sort of theological waymark, showing that the world has moved on apace.

ISAAC KINLEY.

MR. EDITOR: If the human race has been benefited by Christianity, and if woman is a part of the human race, then the only logical conclusion is, that woman has been benefited by Christianity. Any one that accepts the premises

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this proposition must accept its conclusion; and in order to prove the opposite, one would have to show, either that woman is not a part of the unit humanity, or that humanity has not been benefited by the Christian Religion. That the canons of the church have been unjust to woman is true, but that these caused her degradation is a mistake; for the degradation of woman (and of man also, since the two "must rise or fall together") existed before the coming of Christ. And the church, instead of causing the middle ages and woman's humiliation, was really the only beam of light in the midst of the darkness. Indeed, one might as well try to prove that civilization has not benefited woman. But the statement of Bishop Spalding concerning the headship of the man over the woman in the family, is hardly relevant or consistent with the rest of his argument. To say that "either the husband or the wife must be the depository of domestic authority," is a mere assumption; and to add that the man shall be the authority because "the defense of property and rights is naturally intrusted to those whose hands hold the sword," is to advocate the continuance of that principle which elsewhere he relegates to barbarism. "When strength is made the measure of right, woman is inevitably driven to the wall," he says, and gives us to understand that this is to be deplored. Yet physical force, the criterion of barbarism, he makes the criterion of the family. As a matter of fact, the families that are nearest the ideal are those where neither the man nor the woman rules, but where both rule and are ruled. To assume that man is to rule over woman, is to encourage in him that spirit of tyranny which needs no encouragement, and to arouse in her a desire to retaliate which quite often results in an inversion of "headship." H. R. SHATTUCK.

MR. EDITOR: During three years of my course at Harvard, I enjoyed a large measure of the academic freedom that Prof. West deprecates, and I would like to supplement his article with a little of my experience. The faculty tries to dissuade the student from choosing absurdly unrelated studies by means of a paragraph in the catalogue, in which he is "strongly recommended to make his choice with great care, under the best advice, and in such a manner that his elective courses, from first to last, may form a rationally connected whole." I have not known of any other means being used to secure this end, and some choices are made which appear to be dictated only by indolence or caprice. Students are often refused admission to a course because a more elementary or a more advanced one in the same branch is better suited to them; but I never heard of a refusal on the ground that the course was not rationally connected with the student's plan of study. A large part of the undergraduates are earnestly desirous of making such a selection as the catalogue advises; and there have been repeated calls in the students' papers for systematic advice from the faculty, which have elicited a partial response in the form of circulars describing the courses in several departments. Still, I think that nearly all who have been through Harvard under the present policy would agree in rating Prof. West's remedy—a return to a two-thirds prescribed course—as worse than the disease. A remedy that would not involve the loss of any of the benefits of the elective system, would be to enforce the excellent recommendation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I have quoted from the catalogue. Prof. West recognizes that every young man must begin sometime to make decisions for himself, and he recommends as a preparation for this independence a course of study like that of the German gymnasia. He scouts the idea that giving an immature youth freedom will "bring out his sense of responsibility, and compel him to rise to self-possesssion, discriminating judgment, and intellectual ripeness." But it often occurs that a youth, no older or more carefully trained than the average freshman, is called upon to assume large business responsibilities, and if he is made of the right kind of stuff, the effect is to make a man of him, precisely what Prof. West says it could not be. I wonder how he would account for the surprising "self-possession, discriminating judgment, and intellectual ripeness" of the city street Arab. The Harvard movement does not "put a premium on the avoidance" of Greek and Latin; it merely withdraws artificial support from these languages, leaving them to stand before the public on their merits. The amount of mathematics and physical science that the Harvard faculty proposes to require as a substitute for Greek is not likely to attract a lazy boy. It is actually unfair in its severity.

FRED. A. FERNALD.

MR. EDITOR: Prof. Hunt, in the REVIEW for April, told us how to reform English spelling. What is his notion of reform? As a college professor, he assures us that "in the average class of an American college there is but a very small proportion of accurate spellers." Whose fault is it? He has a notion that "the reform of our spelling is a necessity," and quotes with approval Prof. Whiting's crude assertion that "of all spellings in the world the English is the most absurd." The fact is, our spelling is much better than our pronunciation. "In all languages," writes Prof. Hunt, "the relation of sounds to signs should be close and uniformly correspondent." That is true; but why does he immediately turn his whole attention to the reverse of the principle, and throughout his article go on the absurd assumption that the relation must be that of signs to sounds? Let us conform sounds to signs. We are all agreed that "light" does not spell *lite*. Why pronounce it so? The German school-boy knows better; his "licht" is *licht*. I have lost all patience with the spelling performers. They go backward. Our spelling is not perfect; our pronunciation is absurd. Their rules are utterly unphilological. They would have us spell the word as they pronounce it; but we might prefer a pronunciation of our own. For instance, we are instructed to "change *ed* final to *t* where it has the *t* sound." But when and where is "the *t* sound" proper to *ed* final? "Wished" is not *wisht*. And Prof. Hunt should know that "lashed" is not *lasht*, and that "fixed" is not *fixt*. As long as our college professors can make no distinction between sounds, the average class will probably mistake the signs. Is "wished" to be written *wisht*, and "bored" not *bort*? Would even Prof. Hunt pronounce the word "saved" as *saft*? "Learned" is not *learnt*, and "leaned" is not *lent*. We are told to "drop *i* in 'parliament'." Must we throw out the corresponding *i* in "Christianity"? "Drop silent *b* in 'bomb', 'debt', 'limb', etc." I don't see any silent *b* there. Even in these words there is no silent *b* where English is spoken. "Drop the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

h of *ch* in 'choler', 'school', etc." And in "church" too? Our *ch* is but a mongrel form of *k*. We pronounce "school" correctly. We pronounce "church" incorrectly; it is *kurk*. I. J. STINE.

MR. EDITOR: There is a portrait of Schopenhauer in a sitting-room in one of the hotels of Frankfort, presented by the sage to the proprietor, at whose *table d'hote* he dined for many years. The face justifies Robert Buchanan's description in his article on "The New Buddha," in the May REVIEW. Schopenhauer's philosophy was largely influenced by his dinner. He led otherwise a life of seclusion, and his nearest daily contact with his fellow creatures was amid the changing herd of a *table d'hote*, recruited in by the greed and haste of tourists. He thus came to think that the prominent attribute of men and women was animal appetite. His observations of love and marriage were equally superficial; he saw only the external phenomena; no wife or child exhibited to him the spiritual concoid of pure affection. But Robert Buchanan is unjust to both Buddha and Schopenhauer when he describes the latter as "The New Buddha." Schopenhauer was not a plagiarist, nor did Buddha believe in eternal death; on the contrary, Buddha taught that atomic life, upon the fall of its earthly tenement, merged into the Universal, Ever-existing Spirit, as "the dewdrop sinks into the sea." Schopenhauer anticipates some of the physical data of Darwin; as, for instance, that the sexes try to repair in their offspring the physical loss inherited from some ancestor, *e.g.* a short man desiring to mate with a tall woman. This is good detail, but Buddha's view was vastly more comprehensive of spiritual unities. He defined what Herbert Spencer gropes at in his "Eternal Force out of which all things proceed." Christianity is more understandable than either, conveying its definition of life and natural law through the allegory of human forms. It does not affect the spiritual character of genuine Buddhism to say that some sincere Buddhist really believes that its vast comprehensiveness is located in an idol; nor would it be just to say Christianity is untrue, because Dr. Shedd, with equal sincerity, minimizes its eternities in a graven image of his imagination. WILLIAM MCMICHAEL.

MR. EDITOR: Your correspondents who comment on "The Law's Delay," "Why Crime is Increasing," etc., offer us remedies of no special value. The true remedies must start even with the original cause. That cause is the mental organization of the individual, affected favorably or unfavorably by education and surroundings. It must be regarded as immaterial who or what the individuals are, or why they are as they are; the question is, whether they are dangerous to the public order and the personal rights of others. If they are, they must be treated as other dangerous animal are; that is, be placed where they will be harmless. If they can be cured there, let them come back among the order-observing people; if not, keep them under restraint and make them as useful as possible. We quarantine when cholera prevails. We take victims of small-pox to a pest-house, and keep them until they are cured. We prohibit

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marriage between near relatives and insane persons, for fear of diseased bodies and minds in the offspring. Much more should we do these things with persons of vicious and depraved natures, or those with diseased and criminal mental tendencies. The prison at Elmira is on the right road, but legislation is far short of the full requirements. So long as we regard a criminal as a thing to be "punished," so long crime will increase; and the more extreme the punishment the more the depravity. It is not a question of punishment at all. It is a question of public order with personal liberty. Those who desire personal liberty must observe and uphold public order and obey the law. Those who will not must be deprived of personal liberty and of the power to disturb that order. Under restraint and classification, education can be made to do its utmost to develop a healthy mentality. Mercy, philanthropy, and punishment can there have a fair field for exercise and experiment, and the results can be used. As now exercised in reforming the vicious, these means are largely lost. There are only two things that can be applied to unruly persons: restraint, and education that aims to teach them it is best and safest to be orderly. The restraint must come first, and be absolute, beyond escape; then classification, and the education while under restraint; and the restraint must continue until the education is successful, and for life if it fails. Abolish the idea of punishment, and let it be understood that the wrong-doer goes to his civil death, unless he can "be born again," and crime and criminals will rapidly decrease. Let restraint, useful labor, and education looking to development of healthy mentality, take the place of the vicious regulations now existing and called punishment, and a few generations will work wonders in the eradication of criminal tendencies.

C. H. Reeve.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED